

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 1880.

The Week.

THE great Republican "find" of the week has been a passage in a speech of Wade Hampton's at Staunton, Va. He is reported by two of the local papers to have requested his hearers to think how Lee and Jackson would have voted at the coming election, and "to remember that the principles they died for are again on trial to-day." On this getting abroad he supplied to the press his own version of his remarks, in which the only allusion to Lee and Jackson is contained in the question, "Will the men who followed Lee and Jackson sacrifice the Democratic party, sacrifice the South, etc.?" Usually a man's own version of what he said is accepted as either a correct report of what he did say, or as a correct account of what he intended to say. In either case it destroys the effect of what he is reported to have said, by showing that he did not think it a true or wise thing to say. It is, however, just now so important that Hampton should have said what he is reported to have said, as supporting the "Solid South" and "secession" cries, that he finds he cannot escape by any correction, and the original report is published daily by the *Tribune* in leaded type. He very probably did speak as first reported; the evidence on this point seems strong. What he said, too, was in part true: Lee and Jackson if alive to-day would, everybody feels sure, vote for Hancock; and "the principles they died for," so far as known, were the principles that a man's first allegiance is due to his State and that his State has a right to secede from the Union. These principles, however, have been considerably modified by the war, as everybody knows; so far modified that Lee and Jackson would hardly recognize them if they saw them now, and would never think of dying for them. So that when an orator says they "are on trial again" he says a somewhat empty and very rhetorical thing, which political opponents who had a strong case of their own would be very willing to let him withdraw or change as much as he pleased. The frantic eagerness to hold on to it displayed by some of our Republican contemporaries, like the exposure of the English mortgages, has a painful appearance of poverty which cannot but be injurious to their own party. The Hampton speech is a good little thing in its way; but it's a poor thing to go round with as your dearest earthly possession.

There seems to be no limit to the things out of which "political capital" may be made. Some negro voters in this city announced their intention to vote against Garfield because Governor Cornell refused to pardon Cox, while the Italians resolved to avenge the execution of Balbo in the same way. Under an act of the Connecticut Legislature, passed last year, the State Board of Health has ordered an examination of the employees of the State railroads in regard to color-blindness and visual power—a most necessary measure, considering the enormous increase of traffic on all the lines and the extent to which the safety of passengers is dependent on the capacity of the officials to see distinctly and distinguish colors clearly. An examination was accordingly begun last week on the New York and New Haven line by experts of the highest order, and two men, an engineer and conductor, were found defective. Two more were found defective on the Shore line, and then came the mass-meeting, and the petition, and the "intense excitement," and "the pressure," and then an order from the Board of Health to the doctors to stop the examination. The Democrats have now taken the matter up, and declare that as the law was passed by a Republican legislature it must needs help the Democrats this fall, and, in fact, has ensured them the State at the Presidential election. They maintain that the tests applied by the experts are European and monarchical tests devised by rich men, and that they cannot and ought not to be applied to the eyes of poor men in a democratic country. The examination will probably not be resumed until after the election, as otherwise the color-blind vote would all go to Hancock. We think it would in any case. Whittaker's case, which is now before

the Secretary of War, has been indefinitely postponed, probably for a similar reason. His friend, Professor Greener, has asked for a court-martial for him, which he certainly ought to have if he wants it, but it would hardly do to have him found guilty either in September or October.

The old story about the payment for the slaves emancipated by the war, and of the man in Georgia and several men in other States who have filed lists of the slaves so emancipated at the county clerk's office, with a view to claiming the value when the Democrats come into power, has come up again this week. This is probably the oldest campaign story now in use, and, considering the service it has rendered, it looks remarkably bright and fresh. The estimated value of the slaves, at an average of \$300 a head, is \$1,200,000,000, which is to be raised, in case of Hancock's election, either by loan or taxation. The best we can hope for is that the Democrats will not raise it all by taxation in one year. Common humanity suggests that they should borrow a part of it. We ought to add that Democrats will pay none of it themselves. It will be raised exclusively from Republicans, and only in the Northern States. This fact, which has not as yet been mentioned, is important. It accounts for the eagerness to pay for the slaves which Democratic voters now try in vain to conceal. Their own share, if they were honest and decent, would be \$600,000,000, and if they had to meet it the ex-slaveholders might whistle for the money; but the plan of putting all on to the Republicans makes them quite restless.

General Butler has at last caused it to be announced that he is going to return to the Democratic party, and the touching ceremony is to take place publicly at Faneuil Hall, in Boston, on Saturday next. In order, however, that he may not be suspected of unworthy motives he has also caused it to be announced that this year he does not seek the nomination for the governorship, and will fill the place of an humble worker in the great cause by taking the stump for Hancock. There appears to be some doubt whether his advocacy will be beneficial or not, but he is said to be going to quiet the committee on that score by paying his own expenses. His oratory must surely be worth something if it costs nothing. His departure will be a considerable relief to the Republicans, as his former high standing in the party and his retention of a certain Republican following, including Simmons, the Grant Collector of the Port, made even his nominal adhesion a source of considerable embarrassment. That a man of mature age, who was at one time so well grounded in Stalwart principles, and had made himself so terrible to rebels and ex-rebels, should deliberately quit the true church, is, however, no matter from what point of view we look at it, a most distressing circumstance. He must be as honest and patriotic now as he was when Senator Dawes was stumping for him on the theory that his election to Congress was necessary to put a stop to the wholesale murder of negroes, which, according to him, was constantly going on at the South. He will, however, be a very amusing Democrat, and thus meet one great want of the Democratic party—that of "a funny man."

The Republican State Committee of Alabama have put forth an address to the country on the subject of frauds at the late election. It is in the main a well-considered document, and its specifications call for categorical disproof by the victorious party. It opens with a statement of the Democratic modifications of the election law made with a view to the greatest laxity in voting and counting, and then passes to details. The law still provides that the board of inspectors shall contain representatives of both parties, but the Republican nominations were disregarded at pleasure, and a colored inspector was generally chosen for his stupidity and the consequent greater ease of cheating. Some of the tricks described, such as putting out the candle and then stuffing the ballot-box, read like a parlor amusement for children, and in this light the whites evidently regarded the colored assistants and voters. When the poll was overwhelmingly against the Democrats, sometimes the majority would be announced to the expectant crowd and then sup-

pressed in the counting; sometimes a white militia company would be sent for to disperse an alleged mob, before the count was undertaken; and again, a trumped-up charge of disorder would be made by the Democratic inspectors, the polls closed, and the election declared invalid. In short, neither conscience nor bodily fear characterized the behavior of the whites, and the report says, no doubt with perfect truth, that "the people are as much opposed to negro suffrage now as they ever were, and, while professedly accepting the Constitutional Amendment, do not regard it as an offence morally to take advantage of the timidity and ignorance of the negro to nullify his vote." A table embodied in the report shows how the Republican majority in Montgomery County is regularly sustained at Federal and reversed at State elections—an argument, as far as it goes, in favor of Federal supervision at the former, but perhaps not a fair measure of fraud and intimidation, considering the fluctuations of "off years."

The arrival of Mr. Thomas Hughes, in company with a number of English gentlemen and ladies, with and without titles, who are interested in a colonization scheme in Tennessee, has recalled the circumstances which led to the Boston "Board of Aid to Land Ownership" being formed in 1877, and to its afterwards passing into the hands of Mr. Hughes and his associates, for quite a different object. The Boston notion was a philanthropic device for relieving the prevailing hard times by facilitating the transfer of population from cities back to the country, in order to earn a subsistence by agriculture. Naturally, this contemplated the improvement of the poorer classes. The Board went so far as to make a thorough examination of all parts of the West and South with reference especially to a New England immigration, and concluded that the high table-land of Eastern Tennessee offered the most healthy and fertile and minerally rich location for the proposed colony. Beyond this nothing was done, and the necessity diminished with the disappearance of the hard times. The Board's English successors have actually secured a large acreage on the Kentucky border, and have begun to lay out, not far from the Cincinnati Southern Railroad, a settlement which is designed to attract struggling English tenant-farmers, and the sons of the gentry and of the well-to-do mercantile and manufacturing class, who find a home career difficult on account of competition. The colony starts, then, under excellent patronage, with a high grade of population, sufficiently homogeneous, and isolated from the social and political influences of the vicinity without being remote from its markets. Its value will clearly be as a nucleus for opening up a much wider region, and drawing thither not only an humbler class from England, but certainly at no distant day as good Northern stock as is to be found in New England. Meantime, the State's casting its vote in favor of honest payment of its debts will do much to encourage the present enterprise and to hasten future similar ones.

We expressed the opinion last week that the *Times's* Indiana correspondent would, if he were not interfered with, get at the bottom of the Indiana conspiracy. He has done it in less time than we thought he would, and communicates the result in a letter published in the *Times* last Monday. Some of his inferences we think are erroneous, but the strength of his imagination is a guarantee for the accuracy of his facts. The letter contains a good deal of denunciation of the *Nation* and of all "ignorant journalists," and asserts that our suggestion of a corrupt combination between the Republicans and Democrats with regard to the Constitutional Amendments is unsound. It gives the history of the litigation as follows: The "test case," it seems, was made up in New Albany. Whether this is of itself a suspicious circumstance or not we do not know, but presume that making up a test case in such a place must be almost a badge of fraud in itself. It was made up as a suit against the Inspector of Elections (a Democrat) by one James V. Kelso (a Democratic lawyer). Kelso "gave the case in charge" to one John H. Stotzenberg (a leading Democratic attorney). In short, as the *Times* correspondent shows, "it was a Democratic affair throughout." Even before the case was tried a Democratic sheet announced that the amendments would be declared not adopted by the Supreme Court. The lower court, "of course," held the amendments to have been validly adopted, this being "necessary" to allow the other side to

appeal—a new fact in the case, showing that political corruption has tainted the lower as well as the higher tribunals in Indiana. This, however, might have been anticipated; it is impossible to keep the lower courts pure if the courts of appeal are once tainted. The case came to the Supreme Court, "and here for the first time the Republican attorneys appear." Why they appeared the correspondent does not state, but he adds a fact which, to our mind, throws a flood of light upon the case: Mr. Stotzenberg "was given the preparation of the appeal papers."

It is almost needless to add that "when the Republican attorneys came to look at the record" it was discovered that Mr. Stotzenberg had submitted to the court as one of the "agreed facts" that at the April election the township trustee vote had been considerably larger than the amendment vote. We cannot agree with the correspondent that this "was a very singular thing for Mr. Stotzenberg to have done," because Mr. Stotzenberg has been shown to be a Democrat, and consequently a bad man. But it was certainly a very strange thing for the Republican counsel to allow their opponent to draw up an agreed statement of facts for them unless there was a corrupt understanding. The motive for such an understanding may be difficult to get at, but the correspondent has laid bare the facts, and they cannot be explained away. Of the petition for the rehearing the correspondent repeats his previous account. In conclusion he calls attention to the fact that "this whole matter has been cooked up and managed in New Albany for some reason"—one of the majority judges even goes so far as to live in New Albany. He points out, too, that the Albany *Law Journal's* article does not settle the law. We trust he will not allow impatience with our ignorance of the case to prevent his continuing his good work. He is on the spot, and can find out what Stotzenberg is doing if anybody can. All we can do is to draw inferences from the facts as he establishes them, and it occurs to us that the case, as he states it, tends to show a conspiracy between the leaders of the two parties in Indiana—for what purpose, of course, we do not know; otherwise why was Stotzenberg allowed to admit facts which enabled the judges to render their infamous decision? We hope the *Times* will ultimately make known its correspondent's name; perhaps it would interfere with his usefulness to do so at present. We need not say that meanwhile we shall trust that the unseemly license given to Stotzenberg may be explained away.

Nearly one million and a half dollars of foreign gold arrived here from Europe during the week, and a great deal more is on the way. This has happened, too, when the rates of foreign exchange were not low enough to show a clear profit in buying gold at the ruling price in the foreign markets and selling it at current prices here as a commodity. Foreign exchange has so ruled, however, that there was no loss in using gold rather than bills, and the result is an important present and prospective acquisition of gold by this country. At the close of the week foreign exchange was so "heavy" that a further decline in rates seemed imminent. Notwithstanding the gain of foreign gold, the New York banks continue to lose in reserve. The surplus has gone down to \$7,300,000, and in view of the large demands for money incident to the great business activity several schemes have been canvassed for relieving the autumn money market. The most important of these is one by which the Treasury shall substitute "coin" for the \$34,000,000 fund of legal-tender notes held in the Treasury for one account and another of the banks. At the Stock Exchange the week has been dull and uneventful, although at the close a ripple of activity was caused in the stock market by the announcement, on good but not official authority, that a new trunk-line is to be created, in the interest of the Wabash system of roads, by extending the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western road from Binghamton to Buffalo. This would make a route from thirty to fifty miles shorter than the Erie and the New York Central, and would practically make the docks at Hoboken the eastern terminus of the Wabash system of roads. The Bank of England did not advance its discount rate (2½ per cent.), but the Imperial Bank of Germany did put its rate up 1 per cent. Silver bullion in London declined to 52½¢ per ounce; and the bullion value of the silver dollar here fell to 87½ cents (\$0.8778). The scarcity of currency is having the

effect of driving these dollars into circulation, and the demand on the Treasury for them has been larger during the last week than for a long time before.

The news from Ireland does not change in character. There are still reports of Fenian drilling and of the landing and distribution of arms, in which there is apparently more or less truth; but some of the stories, such as the placing of gunpowder in a tunnel under the Cork barracks, are clearly sensational, and intended to frighten the authorities. The Government has been asked what it intends to do in any case, owing to the defeat of the Compensation Bill, if landlords in the distressed districts attempt to evict for non-payment of rent. Mr. Forster has answered unhesitatingly that they mean to enforce the law. The constabulary has accordingly been reinforced by a strong regiment of marines. In fact, any hesitation on the part of the Ministry on this point would lead to a general refusal of rent everywhere, and the practical spoliation of the whole landlord class. But strong appeals are being made by the press to the landlords not to insist on their full rights, in the interest of their own class, as well as in that of public peace. Many of them, in fact most, are between the devil and the deep sea, as most estates are saddled with liabilities under wills and marriage settlements which must be met, rent or no rent.

A weighty and most valuable contribution to the literature of the Irish land question has been made in the *Fortnightly Review* by Judge Longfield, who was for many years, if he is not still, judge of the Encumbered Estates Courts, established after 1847, and whose practical acquaintance with the subject probably surpasses that of any man now living. He acknowledges that the position of the Irish landlords is at present very precarious. They have property without political power to defend it, and that property is an object of envy to electors who in case of spoliation will know exactly what share of the spoils will fall to themselves. He therefore proposes, as a concession to justice, the extension over the whole island of what he calls a "parliamentary tenant-right"—that is, the legal recognition of the interest of the tenant in the land, equivalent to seven years' rent; the rent to be adjusted every ten years by the parties themselves. If at the period of adjustment they could not agree—that is, if the landlord asked a higher rent than the tenant was willing to pay—the landlord could take possession of the land on paying the tenant seven times the amount of the rent demanded. If, on the other hand, the tenant offered a lower rent than the landlord was willing to receive, the tenant on surrendering the farm would only receive seven times the amount he offered. It can be easily seen how this arrangement would work to prevent any wide divergence of views about the rent. Into the other details of the scheme we have not space to enter here, but that it or something like it will be embodied in legislation during the coming winter there can hardly be a doubt.

The state of Mr. Gladstone's health has, of course, a depressing effect on all Ministerial action, and is a serious loss in the matter of the Indian finance, in which a confusion reigns which nobody but himself seems competent to put to rights. But in another way it has helped the Cabinet by the evidence of his immense popularity which it has evoked. This popularity is so great that it has cowed his bitterest enemies into an appearance of concern and even of anxiety. No English statesman since Pitt has been honored and trusted by the mass of the English people as he now is. The recognition of his real greatness is so general that the London feeling about him during the Beaconsfield tenure of office has an almost comic aspect as one looks back on it. There is an aspect of it, however, which is not comic: it seems to indicate a separation in feeling and mental outlook between the wealthy and professional classes in London and the rest of the nation of the most extraordinary and grave kind, considering how much the Government for the time being, as Mr. Gladstone in one of his magazine articles has pointed out, is influenced by the former.

General Roberts, with his ten thousand—exclusive of camp-followers, almost equally numerous—has by this time perhaps ceased to be "in the air": according to a letter from the commander at Kelat-i-Ghilzai he was expected to reach that place on August 24. Amir Abdurrahman, on the 19th, reported favorably concerning the same army's ad-

vance in the first ten days. No resistance had been met with in the Logar Valley or at the gates of Ghazni, but the statement is suspicious that the "Sirdar of Ghazni, who was hostile, had fled," and still more so is another report, according to which Mohammed Jan and Hashim Khan, the leaders of the Yakub Khan party in that central region, were hovering around General Roberts's flanks. These chiefs had been acting ostensibly in the interest of the captive ex-Amir's young son Musa, but they and Ayub Khan, Musa's uncle, may easily make common cause or act in concert for the moment, and if Ayub is strong and energetic enough to check Roberts's march in front, a movement in the rear might still become exceedingly perilous to the latter. But it is more probable that Ayub will fritter away his time and forces by simultaneous or successive attempts, without vigor, at reducing Kandahar and attacking both Roberts and Phayre, who advance from different sides against him. At least the meagre and fragmentary accounts which reach Simla from the theatre of the war, chiefly *via* Quetta, seem to indicate a decidedly desultory course of action on the part of the victor of Kushk-i-Nakhud. The natural difficulties in the way of the relieving enterprises, however, are, as will be seen in our correspondence on another page, great, and Kandahar—blockaded, cannonaded, and poorly provisioned—needs speedy succor. This is best proved by the desperate sortie made on the 16th against a village on the east face of the city, which, though successful, cost the besieged about two hundred men in killed alone, including several officers of high rank. Phayre's movements are as yet more tentative than real, owing to lack of strength and transportation, as well as to the active hostility of the neighboring tribes; but Roberts, having no base, cannot afford to be slow, and the fate of the isolated garrisons—which involves that of his own army—must soon be decided.

The question raised in this country as to the claims of the insurance companies on the money received for the *Alabama* damages has come before the English courts in the case of *Bernard agt. Rodocanachi*. The defendant had some tobacco insured which was captured by the *Alabama*, and he recovered from the United States the amount of the difference between his insurance and the value of his tobacco. For this sum he has been sued by the underwriter, and has been ordered to pay over. We presume he had technically "abandoned" the tobacco when he was paid his insurance, but the English Court of Equity did not, before granting his claim, require the underwriter to show whether he had not on the whole made money by taking war risks, and did not recognize the doctrine that the money paid by the United States was a pure sovereign benevolence, to which the principles of maritime insurance did not apply.

Gambetta has been making another of the speeches which produce a little sensation throughout Europe, not unlike that wrought by the late Emperor's chance sayings to ambassadors at the Imperial Court. He went down to Cherbourg to the local fête, on the 9th inst., in company with M. Grévy, who, though President of the Republic, found himself in the awkward position of being only the second lion of the occasion. Gambetta's utterances were somewhat obscure, but the audience apparently found no difficulty in interpreting such phrases as "There are times in the history of peoples when right undergoes eclipses"; at such times "they should wait in calmness with their hands and arms free at home as abroad. Grand reformation may issue from right. We or our children may hope for it, for the future is forbidden to none." "It is no warlike spirit which inspires this worship [of the army]. It is that we may reckon on the future, and know whether there be in things here below an inevitable justice which comes at its due time." The *North German Gazette*, while treating these sentiments as those of M. Gambetta himself, and not those of the country, says they have given rise to "a feeling of astonishment and sincere regret" in Germany, as showing that "the war party in France has numerous adherents in the ranks of the Republicans," and adds that if this talk means that France, under the leadership of Gambetta, is going to continue the traditions of the Bourbons and the Bonapartes, the Germans will be obliged to familiarize themselves with the idea that their western frontier remains insecure.

HOW TO ENSURE THE ROTATION OF PARTIES.

THE only fresh contribution to the political thought of the day made either by the Democratic platform or by the letters of the Democratic candidates is Mr. English's proposition that no party ought to remain in power longer than twenty years. We presume that if he had expounded it more fully he would have maintained that even twenty years are too many, and that a still shorter term would be desirable in the interests of that purity of administration to which he says long possession of the Government by one party is fatal. It is a great pity that we are not to hear more from him before the election on this theme, because it is a much more fruitful one than his short discussion of it would lead us to infer. If a party remains in power so long as twenty years, it must be due either to the fact that people like it and think it a good party, or to the fact that although they are convinced of its badness, they have no ready means of turning it out of office. So that Mr. English would have greatly increased the value of his letter if he had explained more fully why it is the Republicans have remained so long in possession of the Government. It cannot be, on his own showing, because they have commended themselves to the country by good administration. According to his account no more dangerous or corrupt organization ever managed the affairs of a free country. He would be the last man, too, to tell his constituents that the Republicans stayed in office because the people could not see their badness. No such explanation would find acceptance for one moment among Democrats. The Republican party must then have been enabled to retain its long hold on power by the absence of any effective means of ousting it, or, in other words, by the difficulty of bringing public opinion into action against it. Now, he was bound to tell us in what this difficulty consists. Why is it that the American people, of all peoples on earth, cannot change its rulers, when it ceases to trust them, inside a quarter of a century? If we took him unawares with this question he would undoubtedly answer that it was owing to the enormous electioneering force exerted in its favor by a huge army of officials who are compelled to "work" for it, not simply as a duty they owe to their superiors, but as a means of keeping their places and earning their bread. Having gone as far as this, he would have to go further, and tell us what he, as a reformer, proposed in order to put a stop, at once and for ever, to an abuse which removed the American Government further away from the operation of popular disapproval than any constitutional government now in existence. But on this point he has not offered a single suggestion.

Nor does he tell us how the Democratic party, if it gets into power next year, is to be got out before 1901. That the Democratic party will become corrupt by that time, at the furthest, he virtually admits. He says long tenure of office corrupts *all* parties. He ought, therefore, to have given some hint, at least, as to the means by which we are to expel the Democrats from office when we find their virtue giving way. But his letter contains nothing of the kind. What it proposes is simply that we should put in power another set of men, of essentially the same character and antecedents as the Republicans, to run the same course, encounter the same temptations, and yield to them in the same fashion at the end of the same period. If corruption is sure at the end of twenty years, we ought to be supplied with the means of cutting the term down to ten or eight years. The stock of virtue the Democrats now have on hand would probably last for two Presidential terms, but, as they are human, Mr. English will hardly maintain that it will last much longer, under the conditions which have led the Republicans into iniquity.

Now, if the Democratic Convention had produced Mr. English's theory, and proved their sincerity by a bold offer to legislate in support of it by proposing to do away with all laws or usages or practices which prevent the voter from getting directly at the Government, and making his vote tell on it promptly, they would undoubtedly have produced a profound impression. In the presence of such declarations the vagueness and windiness of General Hancock's letter would have done them no harm. If, for instance, after acknowledging and deploring the difficulty of making a clean sweep of the Administration when it has lost the confidence of the country, the Convention had promised to make newly-elected Congresses meet promptly after election instead of a half year or a year after it; had promised to deprive the party in

power of the means of corrupting public opinion or foiling its action which lies in the employment of eighty thousand Government officers as electioneering agents; to forbid the taxation of Government employees for the maintenance of a fund to be used in preventing any change, and of the disposition of which no public account is ever rendered; to raise the Government officials above intimidation or corruption by giving them reasonable fixity of tenure; to forbid the restriction of the subordinate Government offices, for whose maintenance all citizens pay, to the members of any one party by the use of any political test or through the influence of the Congressmen of one party exclusively—if it had done all this it would have made a genuine, and we have no doubt exciting, demand at least on the confidence of the 2,000,000 young men who this year will for the first time vote the Presidential ticket. They would have freshened the political stream with new waters, which hundreds of thousands would have drunk and felt cured of the unutterable weariness which party warfare during the last ten years has been breeding. They might in this way have induced people to believe that "a change" was really within their reach; for Mr. English is right in saying that people would like a change. Everybody likes a change now and then, and in no sphere of human activity would a change at this moment be more welcome than in politics. But the misfortune is that our Democratic friends talk of change but offer none. Their platform was a mass of the old verbiage slightly altered in arrangement; General Hancock's letter reads like the opening chapter in a child's political primer; and Mr. English proposes that we shall allow the Democrats to perform before us for twenty years some of the old Republican tricks, which he naively admits will at the end of that time convert the Democrats into great rascals and leave the voters in much the same state in which they are now.

The same thing may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of the currency question. The Republicans have not made a very remarkable display of statesmanship on that subject. If they had let the silver coinage alone until they had ascertained the drift of opinion and policy with regard to the double standard in other countries, and had withdrawn the greenbacks as fast as they were redeemed, leaving a really elastic currency of gold and national-bank notes to take their place, there would be now no currency question to trouble us at all. As it is we are threatened with a crisis of some kind, no one yet knows exactly what, by the immense accumulation of silver coin, and by the assumption by the Government, in a hap-hazard way, of the functions of a bank of issue. Had the Republican party come to the resumption of specie payments as part of a well-considered financial policy, the act which provided for resumption would have left none of these subsidiary problems to vex us. But the fact is the party had no well-considered financial policy. It drifted into resumption rather than deliberately resumed. An opposition, therefore, which offered the country, instead of this shifting, happy-go-lucky mode of dealing with the public finances, a clean-cut, comprehensible body of financial doctrine, expressed in the language in use among business men, would undoubtedly offer "a change" which, to a large number of voters, would be very attractive. But there is not, either in the Democratic platform or in the letters of acceptance, a trace of anything of the kind. Every knotty question of finance now before the country is successfully evaded by the use of such vague, and, in fact, meaningless, phrases as "honest money" and "sound currency," and Mr. English so far stultifies himself as to pretend that gold and silver are of equal value, and that you can issue paper which will equally well represent both together.

In short, what the Democratic party promises us is, at best, in this field also, not change but a continuance of the lazy confidence in the good luck of the American people and the abundance of the crops, which has done so much to mar the financial administration of the party now in possession of the offices, but most probably without that sense of responsibility for the public credit which the Republican party, as the creator of the national debt, has always shown. We have no doubt whatever that the party which first promises a real change will get possession of the Government and keep it for many years. The Republican party obtained power in this way, by offering to the imagination of the generation then coming on the stage the promise of something new. This promise it has undoubtedly fulfilled. The party which is to succeed it will have to win in the same way.

Its platforms and letters will, like those of the Republican party in its early days, have no juggles, or *doubles ententes*, or sonorous evasions in them. They will be simple and sincere and plain. They will use about finance and the currency and the tariff the speech of business men. If we do not greatly mistake, they will acknowledge with the utmost boldness that the theory which makes Government employees the servants of the party in power only, and the henchmen of senators and representatives, is neither more nor less than a new form of political dry rot, which threatens the ruin of democratic institutions. We venture to say that Dr. Bushnell's prophecy, uttered now forty years ago, will find a prominent place in its campaign documents, and will furnish the moral enthusiasm without which no party in these days of vast constituencies can hope to triumph. We quoted it last week, but it will bear quoting every week, and here it is again:

"This doctrine, which proposes to give the spoils to the victors, has been imputed mostly to one of our political parties, and, as some suppose, has been avowed by that party. Of this I am willing to doubt. We shall see, perhaps, how far the opposing party will abjure this doctrine of the spoils, and whether it is not yet to be the universal doctrine of politics in the land. If so, then shall we have a scene in this land never before exhibited on earth—one which would destroy the integrity and sink the morality of a nation of angels. It will be as if so many offices, worth so much, together with the seamless robe of our glorious Constitution, were held up to be the price of victory, and as if it were said: 'Look, ye people, here is a premium offered to every discontent you can raise, every combination or faction you can mention, every lie you can invent. Cupidity here is every man's right; try for what you can, and as much as you can get you shall have.' Only conceive such a lure held out to this great people, and all the little offices of the Government thus set up for the price of the victory, without regard to merit or anything but party services, and you have a spectacle of baseness and rapacity such as was never seen before. No preaching of the Gospel in our land, no parental discipline, no schools, not all the machinery of virtue together, can long be a match for the corrupting power of our political strifes, actuated by such a law as this."

DIFFICULTIES OF THE EUROPEAN CONCERT.

THE most serious result of the disaster to the British arms in Afghanistan is probably its effect on the efforts which the Gladstone Ministry is making to secure concert of action between the European Powers for the coercion of Turkey. It is the more serious because the signs are rapidly multiplying that, in default either of united coercion or coercion by some one Power, there will be an outbreak in Turkey itself, which would inevitably bring on a general conflagration. Accordingly, the "Eastern Question" is overshadowing European politics to-day to a degree which has not been witnessed since the Greek Revolution. It is now an undisputed fact that while the Powers are arguing with Turkey the Montenegrins, the Bulgarians, the Macedonians, and the Eastern Rumelians are getting ready to fight, and that in their preparations they have not only the secret sympathy of Russia, but substantial help in the way of officers and arms. It is not likely, and certainly not probable, that any such help is coming from the Russian Government directly; but what happened in Servia in 1876 shows what can be done in this line by enthusiastic individual Russian sympathizers and volunteers. Neither the Bulgarians nor the Rumelians have ever accepted the division imposed on them by the Treaty of Berlin, or have ever concealed their intention of getting rid of it as soon as they were able. It is now openly acknowledged that they think the opportunity for getting rid of it is near at hand, and that the new state they mean to found will consist not simply of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, but of the whole or a large part of Macedonia. This opportunity they evidently expect to be offered them by the attempt of Greece, in case the Powers do not compel Turkey to accept the decision of the late Conference, to seize the territory assigned her with her own forces. This would be the signal for a rising all over European Turkey. It might, and even may, be brought on sooner by a precautionary attempt on the part of the Turks, which they seem quite mad enough to make, to exercise the right given them by the Treaty of Berlin to occupy the passes of the Balkans. Should they make it, as they now threaten, it would undoubtedly be resisted furiously by the people both of Rumelia and Bulgaria, and Servia would probably back them up.

Turkey appears likely to hand Dulcigno over to the Montenegrins. She is bound peremptorily by the Treaty of Berlin to do this, and the

Powers would, if necessary, join in a "demonstration" of some kind to compel her to do it. But the Treaty does not bind her to change the Greek frontier line. It only recommends her to do so, and she denies the right of the late Supplementary Conference to convert this recommendation into a command, and is still confident apparently that the Powers will not agree in enforcing it as if it were a command. There are now some good reasons for believing that this confidence is not without foundation. Mr. Gladstone has been working hard ever since he came into office to bring about the necessary concert, and he has achieved a certain measure of success as regards Montenegro, but it is pretty plain that he has reached the limits of his powers. There seems to be no doubt of the French refusal to join in any military action on behalf of the Greeks, although France was *par excellence* the champion of the Greeks at the Berlin Conference. There is more than one reason for this. The French representative at the first Berlin Conference was much hurt by the opposition of Lords Beaconsfield and Salisbury to his proposal to make the extension of Greek territory obligatory on the Porte. The mild recommendation which was substituted for it is reported, and not without appearance of truth, to have been contemptuously agreed to by Bismarck as an act of kindness to "poor M. Waddington." If Bismarck felt this it would be characteristic of him to say it, and laugh over it. But this was not all nor the worst. The secret convention concluded by Great Britain with Turkey during the Conference, for the transfer of Cyprus and the protectorate of Asia Minor, gave real offence to the French Government as, in some sense, an act of perfidy, or, at all events, as fatal to a cordial mutual understanding. M. Waddington expressed this feeling in strong terms to the Beaconsfield Ministry, but they concealed the despatch, and, in fact, denied in general terms in the House of Commons that any such sentiments as it contained existed, until they had endeavored to soothe French wounded susceptibilities by a correspondence. It is only within a week or two that this fresh piece of their duplicity has been exposed. They did not succeed, however, in satisfying France, although they apparently got her to accept an apology. If it were not that France is now bent on not taking offence the consequences might have been more serious. Anyhow, enough sting has remained behind to make the French Ministry unwilling to follow or appear to follow England's lead in the East, and they probably chuckle a little over the difficulties which Lord Beaconsfield's great triumph at Berlin has created or left behind. The most powerful motive of all, however, for the French dislike of military intervention in Turkish affairs is the nervousness, some call it, though perhaps timidity would not be too strong a term, about all military adventures, which the late war has caused. Any one who was familiar with the French press before the war, and remembers how constantly it preached the duty, and even necessity, of French intervention and French influence to keep the world in order, and reads now the prosaic and commercial view it takes of the national mission, can hardly believe that it still addresses itself to the same people. There could scarcely be a better evidence of the depth of the impression made by the German invasion on the national imagination, and, we might also add, on the national conscience. In spite of the great size of the army, and the flourishing state of the finances and of trade, there is evidently a deep shrinking from any military enterprise, however trifling, and a deep dread of being led into some sort of serious conflict. The sneers at Mr. Gladstone as an idealist and enthusiast, too, who is carried away by his feelings, with which the Paris newspapers abound, are, to any one who remembers the old French editor who used to claim for France "the glorious privilege of astonishing the world," as curious as anything to be found in recent political literature.

Lord Granville appears to have tried to get France to join him in drawing up another collective note in reply to the answer of the Turks, but France has refused to put herself forward in the matter, and England has had to undertake the task herself. How far Austria, Germany, and Italy will go with her is still uncertain. The latest rumors point to the probability that they also will shrink from coercion. What England will do in that case is an interesting subject of speculation. The present Ministry are virtually pledged to act alone, and were the state of things in Afghanistan more satisfactory, there would be but little doubt that she would do so. That Irish affairs will exercise any real influence on the problem is not at all likely. No Irish disturbance is to

be looked for, judging from all recent experience, with which the police cannot deal, and the evident desire and intention of the Government to attempt some radical treatment of the land question must confine any attempt at disturbance to the Fenians, or, in other words, the least formidable body of agitators by which any Government was ever threatened, inasmuch as they do not seem to possess pluck enough for an ordinary street-riot. But the Afghan disaster is really a large cloud on the horizon. It greatly increases the proverbial uncertainty of Afghan affairs, and the effect of it in India, in case it were followed by another check, might be, if not serious, very troublesome. It would not be surprising, therefore, if the Government should hesitate a good deal about laying hold of the Eastern Question in a way likely to make heavy drafts on its military resources, as long as the Afghan trouble is not over. It could hardly undertake to see Greece through her quarrel with the Porte without putting fifteen thousand or twenty thousand men ashore in Thessaly or Epirus; and the difficulty of providing and keeping up such a force in the field when there is any demand for troops elsewhere, in the existing state of the British military organization, has been only too clearly revealed during the last two years of Lord Beaconsfield's mischievous activity. Foreign powers see this, and undoubtedly reckon on it as a reason for thinking that the present show of British enterprise in dealing with Turkey will not result in anything serious, and, therefore, show little readiness to follow England's lead.

That Mr. Gladstone's health has something to do with the suspense of the situation is also very probable. His colleagues would feel reluctant to force on a crisis in the East as long as he was not well enough to take an active part in directing English action in it, and to bear his share in its labors and anxieties. But they are bound by numerous pledges to persist in trying to bring about concerted coercion of the Turk as long as there is the least hope of success—that is, until they have received a categorical denial from every one of the Powers, and that they would not receive one from Russia is very certain. An article in the last *Fortnightly*, recalling the history of previous attempts at concerted military execution of their joint decisions by the European Powers, is instructive and suggestive as to the future course of events, in showing that in no case in which such coercion has been proposed and exercised have all the Powers concerned agreed to take part in it. In all cases, when the moment came for action, one or more—in some cases all but one—refused to go on. Austria and Prussia refused in this way to join in the coercion of Turkey at the close of the Greek Revolution, and France, England, and Russia acted to put a stop to hostilities. After the fighting had ceased, the Turkish recognition of Greek independence was extracted by Russia alone. The coercion of Holland, on behalf of Belgium, was undertaken by France alone, but with English consent, Austria and Prussia refusing to resort to force. The coercion of Mehemet Ali in like manner, in 1840, was undertaken by England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia; France refusing to join. In 1853, again, the coercion of Russia was participated in at the outset only by France and England, Austria and Prussia first standing aloof, but Austria finally in the second year of the war agreeing to deliver the stroke which compelled Russia to evacuate the Danubian principalities, and transferred the war to the Crimea. What all these cases suggest as now likely to occur is, that the majority of the Powers will hang back from the responsibility of initiating any movement against Turkey; but if one undertakes it alone, others, if not all the others, will speedily join, in order to have a proper share in settling the result. Should England move, and the Turks resist, so as to bring the Sultan's continuance at Constantinople into question, there would undoubtedly be a general and rapid appearance of all the Powers on the scene.

ENGLISH JOURNALISM.—IV.

THE MORNING ADVERTISER—THE STANDARD.

LONDON, July, 1880.

NEXT in antiquity to the *Morning Post* is the *Morning Advertiser*. It shares with it and with the *Times* the dignity of being a threepenny newspaper. It can hardly be said to appeal to the public in one sense, although it does so very distinctly in the slang meaning which is attached to that term. In other words, the *Morning Advertiser* is the organ—the barrel-organ, it may be said—of the Licensed Victuallers. It has been so since its first establishment in 1794, and its success depends upon the fact that every

member of the Licensed Victuallers' Society—that is to say, nearly every keeper of a hotel or public-house in England—is obliged to subscribe to it. Its career singularly illustrates that combination of beer and Bible, of piety, pugilism, and publicanism, which has been displayed at many general elections. The gentleman whose name has within the past generation been most prominently associated with the *Morning Advertiser* is the late Mr. James Grant, well known in connection, it cannot be precisely said with literature, but with book-making, as the author of 'Random Recollections' of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords, and of many other things connected with London life; of a work entitled 'The Great Metropolis'; and of two volumes dealing with the history of the newspaper press. The late Mr. Grant's career illustrated the perseverance of Scotchmen, if not the perfervid genius which is sometimes attributed to them. It showed that the determination to succeed is often enough to bring about success without any reference to the intellectual qualities which are usually supposed essential to it. Mr. Grant, before he was editor of the *Morning Advertiser*, had been assistant editor to *Bell's Life in London*—a journal of the prize-ring. He was remarkable for his stern Evangelicism in religious opinion, and in this way illustrated that connection of pugilism, publicanism, and piety which has always been the characteristic of the *Morning Advertiser*. Mr. Grant had such knowledge of politics as is implied in a familiarity with the Reporters' Gallery, but his ignorance of all that lay outside the range of the lobby of the House of Commons and the vestry of the Presbyterian Church was large and comprehensive. In his day the *Morning Advertiser* was the selected dupe of the tribe of hoaxers. Indecent and profane inscriptions in Greek, purporting to have been found on newly-discovered tablets and monuments, were a form of ribald academic jesting of which Mr. Grant was the victim. He usually excused himself when the "bite," as it would have been called in Addison's time, was exposed by pleading that he was not well acquainted with "the Lawten," as Mr. Grant called the language of the Romans. Mr. James Grant did not succeed in permanently maintaining his difficult relations with the Committee of Licensed Victuallers who edited the paper over his head, and whose ignorance of men and things made Mr. Grant appear by comparison an accomplished scholar and a well-informed man of the world. On his retiring from the editorship he was succeeded by a gentleman of some note in literature and of a certain bustling power of achieving notoriety, Mr. Alfred Bate Richards. Mr. Richards, who for some reason or other preferred to call himself Colonel Richards, having held a position probably in the reserve forces which entitled him by indulgence to that designation, claimed in competition with some score of others to be the author of the Volunteer movement. He was always nearly succeeding in various enterprises, but never quite succeeded. He wrote a play called "Cromwell," which approached poetry if not closely, yet, as Mr. Gladstone would say, at a measurable distance, and which had some qualifications, but not, as proved on experience, sufficient qualifications for success on the stage. It was probably superior to Lord John Russell's "Don Carlos," a tragedy, and to Mr. Disraeli's "Don Alarcos," and if Mr. Richards had resembled either of those eminent statesmen in their political success his dramatic attempt would have preserved that sort of interest which attaches to the poems of Frederic the Great and to Goethe's speculations on color. The failures in other departments of men who have succeeded in one order of thought or action are always secularly interesting. Mr. Bate Richards wrote letters upon contemporary politics which suggested to you the idea of a man who had an ambition to be a Burke or a Junius, but who unfortunately had only the ambition. The *Morning Advertiser* in his hands was the organ of a certain premature Jingoism which in its way illustrates the connection of publicanism and pug-nacity—in this case taking the form not of pugilism but of an aggressive and alarmed patriotism. On Mr. Richards's death he was succeeded by the present editor of the *Morning Advertiser*, Captain Hamber, who was formerly editor of the *Standard*. Captain Hamber is an experienced and able journalist, but political journalism in any legitimate sense of the term is scarcely possible in a newspaper whose motto of necessity must be the Licensed Victuallers first and everything else afterwards. The principal leader-writer of the *Morning Advertiser* is understood to be Mr. Charles Williams, who unites with this office that of the editor of the *Examiner*.

The mention of Captain Hamber's name suggests that of the journal which he formerly conducted. The *Standard* is the oldest of the morning penny papers now in existence. It was established in 1827 as an evening journal in the Protestant interest, then alarmed by the impending removal of Roman Catholic disabilities. It was, in fact, the evening edition of the *Morning Herald*, a journal which it has survived, and, like it, was the property of Mr. Baldwin. Its first editor was Dr. Gifford, an Irishman, and a Protestant as only Irishmen and Scotchmen can be Protestants. That is to say, he was a man whose whole creed, political and religious, consisted in vehement and passionate negation of everything that the Church of Rome asserted. The *Standard* under his management was simply a protest and a defiance addressed to every Liberal measure and statesman. Of course it was easy to find literary instruments for any sort of work that had to

be done, and Dr. Maginn, who was not troubled with any very strong convictions of his own, had no objection to defending as fiercely as might be the convictions of Dr. Gifford, or whoever his paymaster of the day might be. The Captain Shandon of Thackeray's sketch recalls the conditions of debt, drink, and imprisonment under which the highly moral and conservative articles of Dr. Maginn were composed. The minor poet, who by a sort of mental irony bore the incongruous Christian names and surname of Alaric Attila Watts, was Dr. Gifford's sub-editor. What there was in common between the bard of the Dissenting conventicles who sang "Let dogs delight," etc., and the barbarous marauders whose names were prefixed to his, is a question which it is interesting momentarily to entertain, but which it is not necessary to solve: it suggests pleasant speculations as to the mental characteristics of the humorous and slightly cynical paternal and maternal Watts. Up to the year 1846 the *Standard*, under Dr. Gifford's editorship, was steady in its support of the successive Conservative administrations of Sir Robert Peel, but when the potato disease in Ireland converted that statesman to free-trade (such are the methods of persuasion which act in England upon what are called practical minds) the *Standard* refused to follow him. It became the organ of Lord Derby and the Protectionists, and it shared their political decline. Mr. Edwin Baldwin, who had succeeded his father as proprietor of the *Standard* and of the *Morning Herald*, found his way into the bankruptcy court, and the *Standard* was purchased in these favorable circumstances by the late Mr. James Johnson, then one of the officers of the court, in whose family the proprietorship of it still remains. It was presently converted into a morning paper. Published in the first instance at fourpence, the price was reduced by successive stages to twopence and to a penny—this latest, and it may be supposed the final, point having been reached in 1858. Under the editorship of Captain Hamber the paper achieved a considerable political and commercial success, which it has more than maintained under its present editor, Mr. Mudford. It is now one of the great newspaper properties and political powers of England. Mr. Mudford, whose father was a clergyman known to the readers of *Blackwood's Magazine* a generation ago as a pleasant poet and agreeable essayist, holds upon his paper a position almost unique in journalism. By the will of the late Mr. Johnson the absolute control of it without liability to dismissal was placed in Mr. Mudford's hands on terms which, compared with ordinary newspaper arrangements, may be described as munificent. Mr. Mudford is at liberty without other restraints than his own sense of duty and his perception of the interests of the paper to do what he likes with it, and to spend what he wills upon it. His position being perfectly secure, he can cease to be editor only by his own voluntary act of resignation. It is pleasant to admit that hitherto Mr. Mudford's conduct of the *Standard* has abundantly justified the confidence placed in him. As the only distinctly and professedly Conservative journal among the morning newspapers of London, Mr. Mudford has had a large field open to him, and he has cultivated that field with success.

The *Standard* has always been honorably characterized by a certain independence with regard to its own party, and by much fairness of mind in relation to its opponents. This healthy political attitude has been, no doubt, stimulated and preserved by a standing quarrel between it and the leaders of successive Conservative governments. They have always shown a disposition somewhat to underestimate its services to them, and to seek by preference their means of communication with the public through the *Times*. Those coveted scraps of information as to impending measures, appointments to office, and ministerial changes and resignations, in the possession of which every journal is anxious to forestall its contemporaries, were systematically withheld from Shoe-Lane during Mr. Disraeli's leadership of the Conservative party and despatched to Printing-House Square. The *Standard* and its readers were reckoned upon as certain. The *Times* and that large neutral public which it addressed were worth winning over, and information, and hints sometimes more valuable than specific information, were the price at which occasional discriminating and ostensibly candid support was supposed to be purchased. When Mr. Mudford succeeded to the editorship of the *Standard* it is believed that he brought the leaders of the Conservative party somewhat sharply to book on this subject. His election to the Carlton Club in anticipation of the ordinary and long delay of the regular ballot, and in priority to many notable persons whose names had been down for years, was a recognition of his power and of his determination to exercise it. A similar fight was fought out with not quite equal success for the time being between the *Standard* and Lord Salisbury when he was special ambassador at the Constantinople Conference. Unfavorable criticism or hesitating support was met by a denial of information, or of facilities for the acquisition of information afforded to journals either more accommodating or more honestly friendly to the foreign policy of which Lord Salisbury was then the representative. When the present Government came into office the *Standard*, during some weeks, showed a favorable leaning to it which looked like a desertion to the majority, and was interpreted in that sense by the leaders and managers of the Conservative party. There was talk of establishing a new and more thoroughly Tory organ, and the relations of Mr. Mudford and the Carlton Club, of

which he had become a member in a manner involving a special compliment to himself, were freely discussed. It is not probable that Mr. Mudford ever deliberately meditated apostasy to Liberalism. He probably wished to try the experiment of converting the *Standard* into a sort of penny *Times*, reflecting the changes of political and parliamentary opinion and giving a support more or less qualified to each successive ministry. The attempt was not long persisted in. Either the remonstrances of the old friends and supporters of the *Standard*, or Mr. Mudford's personal disapproval of the measures by which Mr. Gladstone committed his government to an active and innovating Liberalism, changed his purpose. The *Standard* is now as thoroughly Conservative as Lord Beaconsfield or Sir William Hart Dyke can desire. Mr. Mudford belongs, it is understood, to the class of managing rather than writing editors, but he is ably seconded in the political and literary departments of his paper by contributors. Among these, Mr. Escott, the author of the work entitled 'England: Its People, Polity, and Pursuits'; Mr. Alfred Austen, the poet and critic; Mr. Robert Williams, an eminent Oxford scholar and crammer, who has transferred himself from academic shades to London newspaper offices and law-courts; Mr. Frederick Boyle, whose agreeable and sketchy books on travel are well known; Mr. Percy Greg, the philosophic and political essayist, and Mr. Keble are, perhaps, most conspicuous. The musical and dramatic critic is Mr. Watson, the editor of the *Sporting and Dramatic Times*. Mr. Mudford is himself practically manager as well as editor, but in the latter capacity he is assisted by Mr. Walter Woods. The most remarkable foreign correspondent is Dr. Abel, who now represents it, as he formerly represented the *Times*, at Berlin. Mr. Matthew Macfarlane is the city editor. The *Standard*, perhaps more than any of its penny contemporaries, has adhered to the traditions of the old threepenny days of newspaper management. Its articles are grave and well-informed, but perhaps they somewhat lack in sprightliness and variety of topic. It continues to report the Parliamentary debates with greater fulness than any of its contemporaries of the same price; and its arrangements for obtaining news and accurate information, foreign and domestic, are very complete. It is, perhaps, rather a newspaper for the newspaper man, for the evening and weekly journalist, than for the general reader, but that it suits the general reader, too, is a fact which its large circulation and commercial success abundantly prove.

IS THE FRENCH REVOLUTION DRAWING TO A CLOSE?

LONDON, July 30, 1880.

"I HAVE," wrote Burke to a French correspondent, "told you candidly my sentiments. I think they are not likely to alter yours. I do not know that they ought. You are young; you cannot guide but must follow the fortune of your country. But hereafter they may be of some use to you in some future form which your commonwealth may take. In the present it can hardly remain; but before its final settlement it may be obliged to pass, as one of our poets says, 'through great varieties of untried being,' and in all its transmigrations to be purified by fire and blood."

These words were written in 1790. No prophecy was ever more fully justified. Sixty years later, 1850, De Tocqueville could speak as follows:

"Those who, like the Duc de Broglie, have firmly believed the Revolution to be finished give themselves up to despair, and join to the evil from which we are already suffering a thousand others still more terrible—the fruits of their disordered minds and terrified imaginations. As for me, who have long been convinced that the *social soil* of France cannot at present offer a solid and permanent foundation for any government, I suffer from the same depression, but not from the same terrors and despair. I do not believe that all is over (*tout soit fini*), nor, on the other hand, that all is lost (*tout soit perdu*). I consider my country as a sick man whom we cannot, it is true, hope to cure at once, but whose malady one may greatly alleviate, whose existence may be rendered extremely prosperous, and whose very sufferings may be productive of great results both for himself and for the whole human race."

Thirty years have passed since De Tocqueville uttered the language recorded by Senior. Once again the belief gains ground that the French commonwealth is approaching a final settlement. Most Englishmen hold this belief ungrounded, and sceptics, who think that France may still pass "through great varieties of untried being," have much to urge in support of their opinion. During a period of ninety-one years there have existed, it is said, fifteen different French constitutions; and if this computation be correct, the average life of political institutions in France does not much exceed six years. The present republic, again, exhibits alarming signs of instability. The republic of Thiers differs from the republic of MacMahon; the republic of MacMahon differs from that of Grévy, which in its turn is certain to be superseded by a very different kind of republic presided over by Gambetta. All the old revolutionary symptoms are making their reappearance. Though the country is moderate, men of moderation cannot hold their own. Gaol-birds of yesterday are to-day amnestied and admired, and to-morrow will be triumphant and in power. We know, indeed, that their triumph will not be long. Rochefort, and fanatics prepared to turn on Rochefort as a conservative and a traitor, will never be the rulers of a great country. The old game will, it is whispered, be soon played out again. Weakness will beget

violence. The threatening triumphs of bloodthirsty scoundrels will produce terror, and panic in its turn will produce that cry for order which in France is always the knell of liberty. Add to these reflections, which, as far as they go, are obvious and true, the further consideration that the French nation have not yet shown the capacity for dispensing with the ominous services of a hero, who must be the guide and is apt to be the master of the whole people. I admire Gambetta, but there are few things which seem to me of worse augury than his personal influence. One wonders whether the Republic could stand if fever or apoplexy were to strike down the great Republican leader. Still, in spite of all which may justly enough be urged by those who think that France is still far from attaining anything like that sort of settlement which in England followed the Revolution of 1688, there are valid reasons which I am anxious to state, as simply and shortly as may be, why calm observers may hold, not, indeed, that the Revolution is finished, or even that France may not go through a considerable number of further constitutional changes, but that the era of revolution is visibly, though it may be gradually, approaching its close.

1. Whoever will impartially compare the France of 1789 or 1790 with the France of 1880 must, whatever his political views, admit that the vehemence of the revolutionary spirit has declined. Rochefort and his clique are, it may be admitted, no bad imitation of the men who perorated to excited mobs ninety years ago; the ruffians who murdered the hostages are the worthy descendants of the ruffians who perpetrated the massacres of December. The difference is that ninety years ago the violence of the Parisian mob was tolerated, even when not applauded, by the middle classes of France, whilst the misdeeds of the Commune were punished with stern if not excessive severity by the statesman who more than any other man shared and represented the average sentiment of the French nation.

2. Experience has at last dispersed the mysterious reverence with which a natural misinterpretation of the traditions of the first Revolution had invested all displays of popular violence. Whoever wishes to see how strong was the imaginative effect of the supposed power and authority to be found in the action of a mob, should study the writings of Victor Hugo. This great writer displays under all his rhetoric and exaggeration a keen insight into facts and character, but one can hardly read a few pages of 'Les Misérables' without perceiving that its author is constantly swayed by the idea that there is something sacred in popular violence, and that to repress the action of a mob is in some sense to fight against God. It is, further, pretty clear to any one who studies the history either of 1830 or of 1848 that conservative statesmen themselves immensely overrated the power of the people when rising, as the expression goes, "in their might." It is possible that Charles the Tenth, it is probable that Louis Philippe, and it is certain that other monarchs who, like the King of Prussia, trembled in 1848 at the sound of a street row, might have easily suppressed insurrection by the use of military force. They were victims to the delusion that the people when aroused are irresistible. All mistake on this matter is now at an end. In June, 1848, and again in 1871, the populace of Paris were pitted with every advantage against the army. The fight was fairly fought out, and it was decisively proved that soldiers even of an inferior quality must, if true to their colors, inevitably defeat a mob, even when fighting with all the spirit of which Parisians have again and again made a display. It has further been demonstrated (and this for my present point is of great consequence) that France is, when she chooses, strong enough to curb Paris. In June, 1848, in 1851, in 1871, the country districts fought the capital and won. To say this is not to assert that in France the country is always right and Paris always wrong. The provincial conservatism which on the whole supported the President against the Republic of 1848, has nothing in it to excite keen admiration. What is of importance, in considering whether the Revolution is drawing to a close, is to note the vigor with which the sentiment of the provinces has during the last thirty-two years asserted itself against the feeling of the capital.

3. The great Revolution was in France a social no less than a political movement. There is a general impression that social reform is invariably harder to achieve than political reform. But the fact, whatever be its explanation, is undoubted that the social objects at which Frenchmen consciously or unconsciously aimed in 1789 were in great measure attained, whilst the political efforts of at least two, one might say three, generations have been hitherto marked by conspicuous failure. The social revolutionists were, it must be remarked, nothing like the men known in modern times as Socialists or Communists. The objects sought for by the nation, as by the nation's guides, were the total abolition of class privileges and, what would seem far more difficult of attainment, the transfer of the ownership in land to the cultivators. The first aim was gained almost at a stroke. The second was the result, as has been established by Doniol, of a lengthy process, the details of which must be traced out not only in the debates of assemblies but also in the decisions of the law-courts. The completeness, however, with which the desired end was by one way or another attained is shown by the fact that before 1848 the French country folk had also become the owners of the land, and, as a consequence of this, had also become the most conservative element

in French life. In 1848 all the old watchwords of the Revolution, and many cries, such as the "right to labor," unknown to the men of 1790, were again trumpeted forth by democratic leaders and applauded by famished workmen; but to the surprise of Conservatives no less than of Republicans it was found that in the country the revolutionary formulas had lost their spell. Universal suffrage sent up to Paris an assembly whose one mission was to maintain order. The social revolution was, in the country districts at any rate, over. The one desire of a generation descended from the revolutionists of 1790 was to retain the possessions which had been gained for them by their fathers. They did not, it would appear, lament the Constitutional Monarchy; they did not either hate or love the Republic; what they did care for was order. They thought that the Republic menaced property, and they rallied round the President who undertook to make property secure. These notorious facts point to two conclusions: the first is that the social revolution is probably ended; the second, that if the peasantry feel that the existing Republic does not menace their rights as landlords, the mere love of order—i. e., of things as they are—is likely to make them support the Republic.

4. Though every one feels that the efforts of France to secure a political settlement have hitherto failed, the exact nature of the failure has, I think, not been sufficiently considered. It is not true, as Englishmen often think, that the French have shown themselves desirous of change. Compared with England, America, or, one might probably say, Italy or Switzerland, France is a country which very rarely demands or sanctions legislative changes. The most conservative ministry which within the last fifty years has held power in Great Britain has, I will undertake to say, carried measures the very proposal of which would at the present moment drive France mad with the dread of innovation. The real weakness of French political institutions has been the want of any one point so fixed as to be beyond the possibility of change. In England, in America, in Switzerland, in all countries which politically have passed entirely out of the revolutionary stage, there are certain settled foundations to the existing institutions which no man dreams of altering. That President Hayes should not be succeeded by another President, that the Democrats would, in case of success, turn the Republic into a monarchy, are matters, I presume, which enter as little into the dreams of American radicals as does the subversion of the English monarchy into the ideas of the Right Hon. John Bright. In America, again, as in England, no human being dreams that the decisions of the electorate should not, within their sphere, be accepted as final. In France, as we all know, this is otherwise. No one is sure that a fundamental change of institutions is beyond the range of possibility. As a republic has succeeded an empire, so in its turn, think the Bonapartists, an imperial system may succeed the commonwealth. At first sight, therefore, it would certainly seem that the troubled sea of French politics is not settling down into a calm. Yet a closer view gives a different impression. One political institution has now stood unchanged for more than a generation. Ledru-Rollin was, even in his lifetime, a democrat whose name had no weight in England. Even in France he was forgotten long before his death. But the irony of fate has ordered that he should be the author of the one permanent achievement accomplished by the men of 1848. He decreed, or induced his colleagues to decree, the establishment of universal suffrage. His work has stood firm. The Assembly of 1849 attempted to undo it, and the Assembly perished by the *Coup d'état* made in the name of universal suffrage. The Empire was forced to acknowledge, in name at least, the authority to which it owed such legitimacy as it could claim. The reactionary Assembly of 1870 dared not lay its hands on a power which, after all, was its own source of strength. The mere suspicion that the conspirators of May might tamper with the suffrage threw the whole of France into the arms of the Republic. Universal suffrage, therefore, is the corner-stone of French institutions. It will, one can hardly doubt, remain so; but if this be the fact, France has at last obtained one fixed point in her political arrangements which is beyond change. Of the system which gives every citizen, wise or ignorant, rich or poor, an equal vote, much evil may justly be said. Such a scheme of government has, however, when once firmly adopted, two advantages which, in a country like France, needing above all things to terminate the period of political change, outweigh every defect: it enlists the sympathies of the mass of the people with things as they are; it also corresponds with the prevailing ideas or sentiment of the age. The notion that ultimately the majority of the people ought to be the sovereign power in each state may be erroneous, but it is one which undoubtedly commends itself to general feeling. The loyalty which used to be felt towards kings is dead, or on the way to die. The same feeling, in a somewhat different form, now attaches itself to the sovereignty of the people. To ask the reason for either sentiment from those whom it influences is almost irrational. In the Middle Ages a man was loyal to his king or his emperor just because it was natural to him to be so, and his feeling did not seem to need a reason for its justification. In modern days democrats are loyal to universal suffrage just because such loyalty harmonizes with all their feelings or beliefs, and needs no appeal to reason for its vindication. Neither kind of loyalty is, in times when it is

natural, without a ground; but each owes its force to its being natural. The French Republic is now based on an institution commanding the natural loyalty of Frenchmen. In one respect, therefore, it is based on a rock.

My conclusions may be thus summed up: France may probably go through further political transformations. The vehemence, however, of the revolutionary spirit has declined; the influence of the country as compared with Paris has increased; the social movement has been satisfied by the establishment of perfect legal equality and the creation of a body of small landed proprietors, whilst the political movement has at last led to the establishment of at least one permanent institution. France is, I infer, approaching what, to use an expression of the last century, may be called the Revolution settlement. Whether the process of "fire and blood" through which she has gone has ended in her "purification," is a problem left for the solution of a future age.

A. V. DICEY.

THE CLOUD IN THE EAST.

PARIS, August 6, 1880.

I DO not remember a time when, under the pacific surface of things, the situation of Europe was in reality more confused. The partition of Poland was prepared by a century of dissensions and troubles, but it was planned in secret and executed with much rapidity. The partition of European Turkey is being prepared every day by the bad government of the Turks, by the financial and political difficulties with which the Porte is no longer able to cope; but it will not be an easy work, and for fifty years perhaps to come the Eastern question will remain a thorn in the flesh of Europe. The "sick man" is on his death-bed, but his heirs are not quietly waiting till his will is read: they are quarreling under his eyes. A dozen little nationalities have sprung up, all ready to devour a portion of the heritage.

We have been for the past few days on the eve of a great demonstration by the Western Powers against Turkey. The demonstration, to be sure, was to be merely naval; a fleet was to sail for the Eastern seas, with vessels of England, France, Italy, Austria, Germany, and Russia, with the object of coercing Turkey into obedience to the wishes expressed at the Conference of Berlin on the subject, first, of Montenegro, and, secondly, of Greece. The demonstration was to be the end of the diplomatic period of the new Eastern Question, and the beginning of a new period which was not quite military, but which was evidently, if Turkey proved too obstinate, to be followed by a common military action. The Porte could not accept the new frontier of Greece which had been proposed at Berlin by France and England, and accepted by all the Powers. This frontier may be discussed theoretically, but practically it is difficult for Greece to claim two provinces without having drawn the sword in the late war between Russia and Turkey. It has always been the habit of diplomacy to shape treaties according to the accomplished facts, to the efforts made in some sort of positive action. The Montenegrins fought, and they have been rewarded by the cession of some few towns. But it is quite a new fashion, and it would be a very dangerous fashion, for diplomats to make themselves geographers from the mere love of art, and to alter frontiers because it would suit some ethnographical views. It is almost inconceivable how much harm would be done if it was possible at any time to unite the representatives of Europe, and to give them some nice problems of redistribution of land to settle. Greece has been what she is for forty years; she has a bad frontier, to be sure, and one not adequate to the pretensions of the Hellenic world; but why has its inadequacy been discovered just now?

The extraordinary character of the Berlin Conference has led many thinking minds to imagine that there was something hidden behind the action of the Powers. Their unanimity was, of course, a mere veil. It is impossible that Russia and Germany should look with the same eyes on the development of the Eastern Question. The alliance of Prussia and of Austria is now so close that it may be said that the unification of Germany is achieved—not in the same form as the unification of Italy was accomplished, but nobody doubts that in case of a general war the two armies of Prussia and of Austria would have the same objective. The unification of Germany has been made without any revolution; the Emperor of Austria has kept his crown and his provinces, but, morally speaking, he has recognized the German Emperor as his overlord. On what condition? On condition that there should be no return to the narrow views of the old Gotha school, of what was called Klein-Deutschland, but that the new Gross-Deutschland should accept in the East the mission which Austria has always considered as devolved upon her; Germany is bound to take under her patronage, under her hegemony, the various races of the valley of the Danube and of the peninsula of the Balkans. She must dispute Constantinople with Russia, and not allow the Dardanelles to fall into the hands of a race which is adverse to the German race. The old policy of Austria, which you will find so well embodied in the state papers and the memoirs of Metternich and in the letters of Gentz, has now become the policy of Gross-Deutschland. I have been very much struck lately by the depth and sincerity of the fear with which Russia inspires Germany; the cultured German speaks with a sort of horror of this huge, unfathomable, uncontrollable Mus-

covy, only rising from barbarism, unacquainted with all the Western notions of parliamentary government, and even with civil law. Under the shining surface of a servile aristocracy and a corrupt bureaucracy he will represent to you the great masses of the Russian people as a fearful instrument of invasion and conquest, as a new horde of barbarians threatening the civilization of Europe. There is, on the other side, even among the most intellectual Russians, a curious state of mind with regard to Germany: the Russians consider the German very much in the same light as the Romans used to consider the cunning and learned Greek, who came to Rome to seek for a fortune. The patriots are led to believe that all the corruption of the Russian administration is due to its German elements. You will find this idea in Pushkin, in Ivan Turgeneff. The Russian writer is inclined to look upon the Russian peasant as a model of rough purity and candor, an uncut stone, only waiting for the chisel of civilization.

The personal relations of the two Emperors, of Germany and of Russia, and the convenience of what was called the triple alliance of the Emperors have long prevented the deep-seated sentiments of the two nations from finding expression; lately a great change has taken place, and the reasons of it still remain a secret. Time will show why the German Chancellor turned round on Russia after having used the Russian alliance during so many years as a powerful weapon first against Austria and then against France; the apparent reason given by the official press has been the discovery of some intrigues between Chancellor Gortchakoff and the Duc Decazes. The Russian Chancellor is accused of having coquetted too much with France. I believe firmly that these are only reasons of convenience—apparent reasons; that there has never been any serious design of an effective alliance between Russia and France directed against Germany. Russia may at times have found the friendship of Germany too heavy—"ma funeste amitié pèse à tous mes amis"—but it was impossible for any minister in France in the state of public opinion here to enter into any binding arrangements with any other Power.

The motive-power in the mind of the German Chancellor has not been some *bon mot* of the Russian Chancellor, some hint thrown out in conversation between French and Russian diplomats or journalists; it has been a studied effort to achieve the unification of Germany under the forms best suited to the historical traditions and the feelings of the various parts of the Fatherland. This unity was, so to speak, completed when Prince Bismarck made his visit to Vienna; his presence there guaranteed at the same time the union of the north and the south of Germany, and the preservation of the curious historical aggregation of states and nationalities which goes now under the name of Austria-Hungary. The question which is now really at issue in the East is this: Which will be the controlling power, the guide of the people and the races so long subjected to the rule of the Turks—will it be Germany, will it be Russia? Will Russia be allowed to work at a great Pan-Slavism, while she draws towards her sphere of influence the Rumanians, the Bulgarians, the Servians, the Montenegrins, the Albanians? Will she finally possess Constantinople, and in that case will she allow Austria to extend herself along the Adriatic, and as far as the Ægean Sea to Salonica? The issue is a momentous one, as the rivalry between Austria and Russia, which is of old standing, assumes new proportions from the moment when Prussia, standing behind Austria, is ready to preserve and defend her, and to impose neutrality on France, in case France should be thinking of offering a helping hand to Russia. The issue is so momentous that already there is a vague feeling that the Polish question may be soon revived. Poland is always debatable land; the Poles can hardly hope now to conquer their old independence and to form again a country, but, having three masters, they can choose one master in preference. There was a time when they were willing to throw themselves on the side of Russia, but their hopes on that side have been sadly disappointed. The heart of Poland is still in Warsaw, and Warsaw might have attracted to itself Posen and Lemberg; now things seem to be reversed: Austria has become a constitutional country. The Emperor Francis Joseph is popular, and a great Polish nobleman is said to have told him some time ago: "Sire, la Pologne est à vos pieds."

* The Emperor of Austria is going to Lemberg, the capital of Galicia, a province which he has not seen for several years. Great importance is attached to this demonstration. Even the surviving officers of the insurrection of 1831, who live in Paris, have been invited to go to Lemberg. The visit to Galicia will probably not be without results. The hegemony of Germany will be extended not only to the Slavic provinces of Turkey, but to the old kingdom of Poland and to Cracow. What will Russia do in presence of these dispositions? It is said that even now Loris-Melikoff, who is an intelligent dictator, has approached the chiefs of the Pan-Slavist party; that he has become convinced that Nihilism is only a sort of domestic Pan-Slavism, and that its excesses were partly due to the great discontent caused by the bad results of the last war and the timidity of the Russian diplomacy. Bulgaria is in a state of fermentation; Pan-Slavic emissaries are travelling in all the provinces where Russia means to keep some influence. A great storm is slowly but surely preparing in the East, and the Montenegrin and Greek questions are

merely like those little clouds which you see forming in the sky when the heat has become oppressive and the air is charged with electricity.

THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN.

LONDON, August 10, 1880.

SOME months have elapsed since I wrote to you regarding this seemingly interminable war. For the third time now it may be said to have recommenced in a more disastrous manner than ever, just as the Government fondly hoped that they were about to get into blue water and safe harborage. The defeat of General Burrows at Kushk-i-Nakhud is the direct consequence of the policy of the late Government to set up Kandahar as a (so-called) independent state ruled by a British nominee. This precious scheme was floated just before the late general election expelled Lord Beaconsfield and his sagacious colleagues from office. Like all the foreign policy of the late Government, it is impossible to account for this attempt to dismember Afghanistan except upon the incredible hypothesis that it was entered upon in order to do as much injury as possible to India and Great Britain before being dismissed to impotence and obscurity. A heavy portion, however, of the responsibility for this disaster rests upon Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues. It might have been averted if the policy they have pursued in Afghanistan had not been so vacillating, so feeble, and, to speak plainly, so absurd. There is not a single member of the existing Government who is not pledged, as deeply as words can commit a man, to a policy of absolute withdrawal from Afghanistan. It cannot be questioned that a frank avowal that such was the policy which, now they were in power, they intended to carry out, would have received the enthusiastic support of all Liberals throughout the United Kingdom. Nay, secretly, it would have won the approval of no inconsiderable portion of the Conservatives. The blindest partisan can hardly fail to see, after the events of the past eighteen months, that this war was begun upon calculations which have proved to be entirely erroneous, and was justified by an appeal to fears which are now seen to be groundless. The inability of the Russians to overcome the resistance of the Tekke Turkomans is an evidence impossible to question of their inability to invade, or even so much as to threaten, India. The 60,000 troops we have been compelled to throw into Afghanistan, without either subduing the hostility of the people or obtaining security for ourselves, shows how mistaken were those who declared that we had but a military promenade before us.

Afghanistan itself had been broken up by our operations into three tolerably well defined states. The northern part of the country had accepted the rule of Abdurrahman Khan; all the southern parts, including Kandahar, the country of the Duranis, and Herat, acknowledged the supremacy of Ayub Khan; while central Afghanistan—the country of the Ghilzais, with Kabul as its capital, and where the bulk of our armies was collected—remained true to the deposed Amir, Yakub Khan, and in his absence to his infant son, Musa Jan. The obvious policy for the incoming Government was to recognize this tripartite division of Afghanistan as an accomplished fact, and act accordingly. Abdurrahman had established himself in northern Afghanistan without coming in any way into opposition to us; with him, therefore, we had nothing to do. Instead of setting up a powerless puppet to rule in Kandahar, and thereby converting Ayub Khan into an active enemy, the obvious policy of the Government ought to have been to make Ayub Khan into a firm friend by making Kandahar over to him. In like manner, in central Afghanistan they should have recognized Musa Jan as the Amir elect of the Ghilzais, and all negotiations for peace and withdrawal ought to have been conducted with the great chiefs who had remained true to him from the beginning. Had this been done, every British soldier in Afghanistan would long ere this have been withdrawn within the frontier of our Indian Empire, and Afghanistan itself would have been at peace; for the three sovereigns I have enumerated, though strong enough in all probability successfully to maintain each his own possessions against attacks from the others, are not strong enough to act aggressively. In a strange, haphazard fashion a "balance of power" had in fact been brought about in Afghanistan at the time when the Liberal Government assumed office, and, in order to effect a speedy and dignified evacuation of the country, all that was needed was that the Government should make over those districts occupied by our troops to the men who had the power to rule and maintain them. The elementary sagacity to perceive this was lacking to the new Government, and the consequence is that affairs in Afghanistan are at this moment in greater perplexity and confusion than at any previous moment since we entered the country. They spent months hunting about for that impossible combination, an Amir capable of maintaining order and also a *staunch friend of the British*—as if any Afghan could be "a staunch friend of the British" who was not also a base and incapable traitor, so far as his own people were concerned. And so, instead of recognizing Musa Jan as the Amir of central Afghanistan, we have conferred that title upon Abdurrahman, who has neither party nor power among the Ghilzais. And instead of negotiating with Ayub Khan in southern Afghanistan, the Government clung to Lord Beaconsfield's puppet Wali

of Kandahar, and the result is that twelve hundred British soldiers have fallen in a rout as complete and disastrous as ever overtook a British force.

There are at present two British garrisons in positions of considerable danger. About a thousand men are shut up in Kelat-i-Ghilzai, and between three and four thousand in the citadel of Kandahar. The latter are in the most pressing danger. The citadel, indeed, is too strong to be taken by assault; but it is too small to afford adequate accommodation to three thousand men, and at this season of the year the sick and wounded will suffer severely from the great heat and the innumerable flies. It requires that a man should have been in Kandahar to understand what is meant by a "plague of flies." Worse than these, however, is the scantiness and quality of the water. There is poison in the sparkling rivulets which circulate within and around Kandahar. For centuries the inhabitants have been accustomed to bury their dead immediately beyond the walls of the city, so that all around Kandahar the country is one huge cemetery, and this accumulation of human remains has made the water very impure and dangerous to drink. General Primrose, who commands at Kandahar, has already written, expressing his apprehension lest the supply of water should fail him if he be not promptly relieved. Forces from two different quarters are being hurried up to his relief, and it is to be hoped that they will be far on their way before this letter has appeared in your columns. Nevertheless, from both quarters the operation is a hazardous one, and can hardly be effected without some heavy fighting. One relieving force, under command of General Phayre, is to advance from Quettah; the other, under General Roberts, to march from Kabul. It will, perhaps, be of interest to your readers to have a description of the route which these columns will have to take.

General Phayre is at present calling in his detachments and collecting carriage at Quettah, and does not expect to be able to commence a forward movement until the 20th of this month. The troops holding the line between Kandahar and Sukkur on the Indus number upon paper eleven thousand three hundred and fifty-three men of all arms. But of these one thousand two hundred have fallen at Kushk-i-Nakhud; between four and five thousand are shut up in Kelat-i-Ghilzai and Kandahar; another seven or eight hundred men are besieged in the fort of Chaman; so that if General Phayre strips the entire line of communication he will not have many more than four thousand men with whom to march on Kandahar—a very insufficient force, unless supported by General Roberts, to meet the army of Ayub Khan, which, since the battle of Kushk-i-Nakhud, has certainly swelled to double its original strength. Quettah is not itself in Afghanistan, but stands at the head of the Bolan Pass in the territories of the Khan of Kelat. It is a march of twenty-five miles to the Afghan boundary. Kelat is divided from Afghanistan by a range of barren stony hills, and the actual gateway between the two countries is a narrow, tortuous defile winding through these hills, and affording positions where a handful of resolute men could greatly impede the march of an army. It is not here, however, that General Phayre will encounter resistance. Emerging from these hills his force will debouch on the Pishin Valley. The tribes that dwell in the mountains bordering this valley are already up, and our convoys have been attacked. But General Phayre is not likely to meet with any formidable opposition in traversing the valley. Three marches across the valley will bring his troops to the Khojak Pass, and it is at this point that his difficulties will commence. The ascent from the valley to the summit of the Khojak Hills is at first very gradual, but as the summit is approached the road becomes increasingly precipitous. The road winding in and out among the hills is almost the only part of southern Afghanistan that is not entirely hideous. The hillsides are clothed in verdure and dotted with fruit-trees, while a bright mountain rivulet intersects every grassy valley which on either side of the road runs up between the ridges of the hills.

The Khojak Pass is seven thousand feet above the sea—the highest point in southern Afghanistan. Standing on the summit of these hills the traveller looks down upon the broad plain which stretches away almost to the walls of Kandahar, a vast wilderness of red sand, which the action of the wind has piled into huge ridges. Immediately below him, at a distance of four or five miles, is the British post of Chaman, the great dépôt for supplies for the garrisons at Kandahar and Kelat-i-Ghilzai. The Khojak Pass and Chaman are connected together by a zigzag road cut out of the sides of the hills, the work of British engineers since the commencement of the present war. It is in forcing the Khojak Pass, and in the descent to Chaman, that General Phayre is likely to encounter his chief difficulties. The Khojak Hills are the habitation of the Atchikzais, an Afghan tribe who, in the war of 1838, showed themselves both daring and skilful in the practice of guerilla warfare. Hitherto we have purchased their quiet behavior; but the telegraph informs us that the news of the British defeat has summoned them to arms, and if they can concentrate on the Khojak in any force there will be heavy fighting before they can be dislodged. The descent from the Khojak is likely to prove a still more hazardous operation. The British posts in rear of Kandahar were some days ago driven back to Chaman; that post is besieged, and was yesterday reported to have been taken. Such an event would mean not only that we had lost a large quantity of supplies, but that a force of seven

hundred men had been added to the heavy list of casualties sustained at Kushk-i-Nakhud. The report, however, requires confirmation. The Afghans have not yet had time to collect a sufficient force at this point to carry so important a post. But though the fort at Chaman may escape capture, there can be no doubt that long before General Phayre has reached the Khojak Pass a multitude of Afghans will be collected in the plains below to attack him as he descends. Assuming him to have been victorious here, there remains a march of eighty or ninety miles across an open country, where, at any moment, he might find himself confronted by Ayub Khan's victorious army.

General Roberts, meanwhile, at the head of 8,000 picked troops, is hurrying down from Kabul. The distance between that city and Kandahar is 315 miles, and this General Roberts hopes to traverse in 25 days. He may possibly do so if he encounters no opposition. But it is not supposed that he will cross the country between Ghazni and Kelat-i-Ghilzai without having to fight at least one considerable action. The Kelat-i-Ghilzai garrison he will relieve and carry on along with him, and his object, I imagine, will be to unite every available British soldier into a single force before seeking out and attacking Ayub Khan. Supposing him to be successful in this, he would be able to bring about 16,000 men in line. The Afghan army would not be less than 30,000, which, with the recollection of Kushk-i-Nakhud still fresh, would be certain to fight with courage and obstinacy. What, however, the plans of Ayub Khan may be we are entirely ignorant. My own impression is that he will remain in the vicinity of Kandahar until Phayre has passed Chaman and Roberts has relieved Kelat-i-Ghilzai, when he will withdraw in the direction of Herat; and if overtaken it is not improbable that a second action may be fought not far from the scene of our defeat. It is to be hoped that when such a battle has been fought and won, the British Government will recognize the necessity of withdrawing from the country and relinquishing the benevolent intention set forth in the Queen's speech at the opening of Parliament—to bestow "institutions" upon Afghanistan.

Correspondence.

A CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I agree with your correspondent "F. W. H.," in your issue of August 19, that the abolition of the spoils system is second only in importance to the abolition of slavery, and that there is an amazing popular ignorance and indifference on the subject. The formation of a publication society, as he suggests, seems the most feasible and the first step to take. I have always had a liking for the Quaker who "pitied the poor man five dollars," and I venture to follow his example. I shall be glad to be one of five thousand to give one dollar a year, or one of one thousand to give five dollars, or one of one hundred to give fifty dollars to raise the five thousand dollars which "F. W. H." estimates as the annual cost of a publication society.

Yours truly,

J. B. M.

NEW YORK, August 20, 1880.

[We have received several letters on this subject, for which we hope to find room in our next issue.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., Chicago, have in press 'British Thought and Thinkers—Critical, Biographical, and Philosophical,' by Prof. Geo. S. Morris, of Johns Hopkins University; and 'A Manual of Classical Literature,' by Charles Morris.—Harper & Bros. will shortly publish 'Historical Studies of Church Building in the Middle Ages,' by Prof. Charles Eliot Norton; 'Four Centuries of English Letters,' epistolary selections by W. Baptiste Scoones; and the last volume of Green's 'History of the English People.'—'The Political History of Recent Times,' 1816-1875, is the title of a work by Prof. William Müller, of Tübingen, to be issued by Little, Brown & Co.—J. R. Osgood & Co. announce 'New and Old,' a volume of verse by John Addington Symonds.—Mr. Aldrich's 'Stillwater Tragedy' will be brought out next week by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.—The twenty-eighth annual report of the Boston Public Library is chiefly noticeable for its account of the first step taken to connect the use of the Library with instruction in the public schools. We do not feel sure that it is a step in the right direction.—Punctually on the eve of the Boston meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science appears the plump volume of the Proceedings of 1879 at Saratoga. Prof. R. H. Thurston's paper on the strength of American timber, Mr. Warren Upham's on the succession of glacial deposits in New England, and Col. Gar-

rick Mallery's on the sign-language of the North American Indians, are among the more interesting.—Dr. Janeway, of the New York City Board of Health, and Dr. Hunt, Secretary of the New Jersey State Board, have united in pronouncing Princeton College to be "in a thorough sanitary condition," in consequence of the complete overhauling of the drainage system and the introduction of an additional water-supply. There is, therefore, happily no fear of another such outbreak of fever as that near the close of last term, with its well-known fatal results.—In recent numbers of the Newport *Mercury* (Aug. 7 and 14) Mr. Jas. E. Mauran gives some random jottings on the early importation of China-ware into America. For the most part the old invoices and advertisements he has consulted refer to the trade of Newport. Thus, the first use of the term *China* occurs in connection with an importation of sixty pieces into that town in July, 1722.—In the August number of the *American Art Review* Mr. Linton gets upon debatable ground with his "History of Wood-Engraving in America"—namely, the *Harper* and *Scribner* competition. But his qualifications, for feelings' sake, are profuse and altogether creditable as well as prudent. Mr. R. Swain Gifford and his works form the subject of the leading article, and the etchings of Mr. John Henry Hill are catalogued and discussed by the editor, with the help of illustrations in both cases. Mr. W. R. Hodges, describing the private collection of Mr. S. A. Coale, Jr., of St. Louis, tells of an Alvarez which "represents an incident in the life of Rousseau, as related in his 'Confessions.' Two bewitching women are standing upon ladders gathering oranges, which they toss to him below." This is an illustration of the cherry-tree incident with a vengeance.—The seventh number of Vapereau's 'Dictionnaire des Contemporains' (New York: F. W. Christern) reaches and breaks off with Napoleon III., and as six and three-quarters pages are already devoted to him, without including the war of 1870, it is clear that the notice he obtains will greatly exceed that bestowed upon any of his contemporaries. MacMahon is allowed four pages; Mazzini a page and a half; Moltke three-quarters of a page. Among Americans, Gen. McClellan figures at greatest length.—Part 17 of Oncken's 'Allgemeine Geschichte' (New York: B. Westermann & Co.) concludes Dr. Philippson's "Age of Louis XIV.," and A. Brückner's "Peter the Great"; while in Part 18 Dr. Hertzberg's "Ancient Rome" advances to within one stage of its conclusion, ending here at the battle of Philippi. The illustrations are of the usual high quality—portraits of the Grand Monarch, of Emperor Joseph I., Emperor Charles VI., Frederic I. and Frederic William of Prussia, etc.; the Tivoli temples, Pyramid of Cestius, Tomb of Cecilia Metella, busts of Cicero, the young Octavian, Junius Brutus, etc. Most interesting, however, is an authentic view of the Acropolis of Pergamos, showing the site of the great altar of which Berlin now boasts the spoils. In subsequent issues, the publishers announce, will be given cuts of some of the groups of the gigantomachy. Till they appear, the binding of vol. ii. should be postponed.—Seven parts of M. Sarcey's second series of 'Comédiens et Comédiennes' have now appeared, and we have portraits by pen and pencil of MM. Worms, Barré, Coquelin cadet, and Mlle. Samary of the Comédie-Française, of M. Lafontaine, a former associate, and of Mlle. Blanche Pierson and Jane Essler. Encouraged by the success of M. Sarcey's sketches of the stage celebrities of the present time, M. Jouaust has planned a series of the histrionic notabilities of the past. 'Acteurs et Actrices du temps passé,' written by M. Ch. Gueullette and illustrated by the needle of M. Lalauze, is appearing in parts similar to those of M. Sarcey's invaluable volume. The first two on Baron, Molière's pupil, and Mlle. de Champmeslé, Racine's mistress, are ready and will be followed by a third on Armande Béjart.—G. Barbéra, Florence, announces the publication early next year of a volume of 500 pp. 16mo, entitled *Annuario della Letteratura italiana*, to be edited by Drs. Guido Biagi and Guido Mazzoni. It is intended to make this annual a "useful repertory of biographical, bibliographical, and statistical data, and of whatever best represents the Italian intellectual movement, whether manifested in books or literary periodicals, or in the theatre, the universities, and the academies."—We have received the circular programme of the third International Salvage or Safety (*Salvataggio*) Congress, to be held in Florence on September 23-29. Accidents by rail, by ordinary conveyance, on rivers and on the high seas, by flood and fire, by wounds and poison—their prevention and cure—are the chief topics announced for discussion.

—A correspondent writes us from Washington:

"Perhaps some of your readers who were interested in reading Mr. Davidson's notice of the Abbé Rosmini, and have never read or heard of Dr. Brownson's profound and exceedingly interesting critical notices of the works and philosophical systems of Gioberti and Rosmini, would be glad to have references to some of his articles, which I have hunted up. See *Brownson's Review* for April and July, 1864, for two articles on Gioberti. The article in the July number, at pages 304, 309, 310, and 311, incidentally notices Rosmini, and points out what Brownson considers a weak point in his system. See also the number for January, 1874, page 27, and for April, 1874, page 154. One of Brownson's most interesting articles is that on 'The Problem of Causality' in the October number for 1874; and on pages 496, 502, and 503 are notices of Rosmini."

—Our readers will have seen in the daily press, since our last issue, Prof. Mommson's letter to Prof. Nettleship, of Oxford, gratefully declining external offers of assistance, as he had already put aside similar propositions coming from his own countrymen. His personal loss in books he thinks overrated, and that it can nearly be made good by his insurance. He adds:

"I am thankful for the preservation of the materials prepared for our great epigraphical work. They have been heavily damaged, and the restitution will cost much labor already got over and now to be repeated; but I hope and trust still to be able to finish that part of the 'Corpus' which has been confided to my care, and of which I thought to have written the last page the very night of the disaster."

—Mr. E. B. Washburne's paper on "Thomas Paine and the French Revolution" in the September *Scribner's* is, the continued articles apart, the most substantial contribution to the number. It is but an ordinary performance, from a literary point of view, and marked by a good deal of chronological disorder. This is heightened by an evident misprint of 1793 for 1792 in the date of the *Moniteur* given on p. 776, and by the writer's assumption on p. 774 that because Paine was elected before the expiration of the Legislative Assembly, he was chosen a delegate to that body and not to the Convention which immediately succeeded it. Generally speaking, however, Mr. Washburne was right in supposing that the story of Paine's career in France would be a novelty to Americans. He supplies, besides a narrative of events, a letter of Hérault de Séchelles' and other inedited documents of interest. Lieut. Greene's "Over the Balkans with Gourko" is supplementary to this writer's elaborate report on the Russo-Turkish war already published in book-form. It is slightly disappointing in its graphic quality, but the imagination may well be left to complete the picture which he draws of Bulgarian and Mohammedan atrocities in the present Rumelia, as the contending armies swayed back and forth over the same territory, and of the awful hegira of the Turkish population from the interior to Constantinople and the seaboard. A beginning is made of a translation of Alfred Sensier's life of Jean François Millet, with fac-simile illustrations; it is of good promise. The Dickens series is continued by tracing pictorially and otherwise the scenes associated with 'Pickwick' and 'Nicholas Nickleby'; Mr. A. R. Macdonough offers a warm and sympathetic estimate of Mr. Richard Henry Stoddard; and, to conclude without exhausting the varied table of contents, Dr. H. C. Wood makes an effective rejoinder to Dr. Leffingwell on the value of vivisection. Perhaps we should mention, among the curious illustrations to Mr. Schuyler's "Peter the Great," two representing a revolver cannon and a circular mitrailleuse of Peter's time.

—Mr. W. H. Bishop's second and apparently last paper, in the September *Harper's*, on "Fish and Men in the Maine Islands" perhaps surpasses the former in lightness of touch and in a certain poetical felicity of description. But we feel inclined to question the correctness of the "local color" of "the fleet at night, with its numerous lanterns (*green to port, and red to starboard*). The illustrations are again of notable excellence. More striking, and in a different way interesting, is the long array of fac-simile portraits of the family of George III. accompanying a sketch of its several characters and fortunes. The subject is difficult to handle within narrow limits, but the writer, K. M. Rowland, has been fairly successful in avoiding confusion and dullness. A cognate theme is treated by Mr. Eugene L. Didier, when tracing the transatlantic career of three Baltimore belles, granddaughters of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who became Lady Stafford, Marchioness of Wellesley, and Duchess of Leeds, respectively. Mrs. Rebecca Harding Davis, besides winding up her "By-Paths in the Mountains" with a love-match, actually uses this last instalment as an apology for the moonshiner. The good-natured North-Carolinian who resorts to illicit stilling in order to earn a little cash for his pretty wife, and something better than a wolfskin covering for his babe, is surprised by "a grim, ill-conditioned fellow" and two assistant revenue officers, and kills one of them. Imprisoned, his wife brings him liberty in the shape of a saw, and nobody in the neighborhood seems surprised or displeased. Mrs. Davis's heroine tartly rebukes an officious admirer who "was outraged at this lax condition of morals," by telling him there is "a great deal to be said on the other side of the question"; and so there is, but whether more is not to be said on the side of law and order is what Mrs. Davis omits to explain. Mr. M. D. Conway, writing of the "Seven Sleepers' Paradise beside the Loire," has something novel to relate of the actual cave-dwellers of the vicinity of Tours, and pokes his usual fun at Catholic saints and miracles. Mr. Curtis, in the Easy Chair, pays an affectionate tribute to the memory of the late George Ripley.

—Mr. Aldrich brings his "Stillwater Tragedy" to a close in the September *Atlantic* in some not very tragic chapters, and with the good nature which it has all along been plain would not fail him in the crisis. A rather long "short story" by Miss Olney is the only other contribution in fiction, a department in which, by the way, the *Atlantic* has come to depend too exclusively upon its editor's own work to maintain its old place easily. Mr. Trowbridge has a poem celebrating the fact that he is "Twoscore and Ten,"

with a simple and wholesome plaintiveness and an excellence of execution equally agreeable and rare in magazine verse; the average character of this is better illustrated by the other poems of the number. Kate Gannett Wells writes of "Women in Organizations," and her article is perhaps the more suggestive for being chiefly statistical. The sixth instalment of "Reminiscences of Washington" gossips about the Harrison Administration, 1841. Of two political articles, an anonymous one on "The Progress of the Presidential Canvass" and Mr. Bowker's on "The Political Responsibility of the Individual," the latter is much the better, and, indeed, deserves higher praise than saying this implies; the other has been written too often in the daily press to render apt its appearance here. The reviews are in no way remarkable, though that on Mr. Richard Grant White's works is worth reading. Mr. White's own paper on "Oxford and Cambridge" and a first article describing the "Intimate Life of a Noble German Family" are perhaps the best prose contributions to the number, measured by the magazine standard of excellence which involves the admixture of interest and value in such proportions as to secure agreeableness first of all. A reference of Mr. Perry's to 'The Bride of Lammermoor' in his article on Scott, too, is worth the reader's attention.

—*Lippincott's* for September is rather monotonous, a defect not altogether atoned for by the quality of the different papers. Excepting the short stories, which are of the average merit (for some time this has been greater than that of the magazine's rivals, it should be said), and the poetry, there are five articles on allied subjects out of a possible seven. These are the concluding paper on A. H. Siegfried's "Canoeing on the High Mississippi," and "Ekoniah Scrub: Among Florida Lakes," by Louise Seymour Houghton, which lead the number, and are sprightly memoranda of ordinary incidents of travel in the less-explored regions of America; "Short Studies in the Picturesque," by William Sloane Kennedy, which draws attention to the artistic possibilities of New England, the hemlock forests of the Alleghanies, and the canals of Pennsylvania; "Newport a Hundred Years Ago," by Frances Pierrepont North, a historical picture which suggests that the present charms of the watering-place do not rival the past glories of the old sea-port; and fifth and best, "A Villeggiatura in Assisi," a charming description of Assisi and its cathedral by the clever author of 'Signor Monaldini's Niece.' The fifth chapter of Miss Campbell's "Studies in the Slums" is one of the best; the first of two papers by L. Lejeune on "Horse-racing in France" is excellent in its way. The "Monthly Gossip" notices the last *Salon*, giving the names and addresses of American exhibitors; and the reviews are good enough to induce the wish that there were more of them.

—From the last London *Bookseller* we glean the following announcements of forthcoming English publications. In biography: 'Life of Colin Campbell, Lord Clyde,' by Lieut.-Gen. Shadwell; 'Early Life of Charles James Fox,' by George Otto Trevelyan; 'Madame de Staël,' by A. Stevens; 'Public Life of the Right Hon. John Charles Herries during the Reigns of George III., George IV., William IV., and Victoria'; 'Life and Letters of John, Lord Campbell,' edited by his daughter, Mrs. Hardcastle; 'Mrs. Grote,' a sketch, by Lady Eastlake; 'Mémorial of the Personal Life of David Livingstone,' by Dr. Wm. G. Blaikie; and 'Life and Letters of John T. Delane, late Editor of the *Times*,' by Sir George W. Dasent. In travels: 'Voyage of the *Vega*,' by A. E. Nordenskiöld; 'Siberia in Europe,' by Henry Seebohm; 'Eastward Ho!—a naturalist's journey in Borneo and the Sooloo Archipelago—by F. W. Burbridge; 'Japan: its History, Traditions, and Religions,' by E. J. Reed; 'A Visit to Wazan, the Sacred City of Morocco,' by Robert Spence Watson; 'The Land of Gilead,' by Lawrence Oliphant; and 'A Trip to Manitoba,' by Mary Fitzgibbon. To these we may add 'India in 1880,' by Sir Richard Temple; 'American Food and Farming,' by a *Times* correspondent; and Mr. E. A. Freeman's 'Historical Geography of Europe.' In science Mr. Darwin leads the list with a work on 'The Power of Movement in Plants,' in which he has been assisted by his son, Mr. Francis Darwin. We also notice Mr. St. George Mivart's 'The Cat: an Introduction to the Study of Backboned Animals, especially Mammals'; a 'Dictionary of Medicine,' edited by Richard Quain; a 'Popular Account of the Introduction of Peruvian Bark from South America into British India and Ceylon,' by Clements R. Markham; and another of Mr. Richard Jefferies's delightful out-door excursions in natural history, 'Round About a Great Estate.' Samuel Smiles continues his well-known series with a volume on 'Duty'; the author of 'Ecce Homo' now writes of 'Natural Religion'; the Rev. John Julian furnishes a 'Dictionary of Hymnology.' We conclude with mention of 'A Popular Introduction to the History of Greek and Roman Sculpture,' by Walter Copland Perry; and 'Lectures on Architecture,' delivered before the Royal Academy by the late Edward Barry.

—Prof. A. Bartoli's important work, 'The First Two Centuries of Italian Literature,' which has been appearing in parts for the last ten years, has just been completed. It forms part of the great encyclopædia entitled, 'L'Italia sotto l'aspetto fisico, storico, artistico, etc.,' published at Milan by Dr. Fran-

cesco Vallardi, and noticed in the *Nation*, No. 464. Bartoli's book forms a volume of about six hundred pages 8vo, and is very unequal in its execution. The earlier part, on the formation of the language, the dialect literature, etc., is excellent, but that referring to Dante is worthless, consisting of a voluminous analysis of the 'Divine Comedy,' which might as well have been printed in full. The concluding portion, devoted to Boccaccio, is also unsatisfactory, being limited exclusively to an examination of the 'Filocolo' and the sources of the 'Decameron,' the author naïvely remarking that "the same study which we have made of the 'Filocolo' should be made of all the other minor works of Boccaccio. But that not being possible in this work, we pass to a rapid examination of the 'Decameron.'" In spite of these faults we have here the first critical history of Italian literature. The later period will be treated by Prof. Bartoli in his 'History of Italian Literature,' the first three volumes of which, covering the same ground as the above-mentioned work but in a more popular manner, have already been published (Florence, 1878-80), and the first volume noticed in the *Nation*, No. 730.

INGLIS'S AUSTRALIA.*

UNLIKE Mr. Crawford, whose travels we recently had occasion to review (*Nation*, No. 784), Mr. Inglis is entirely contemporaneous in his accounts. His narrative begins in February, '77, and comes down so late as to be able to be illustrated in passages of peculiar point with quotations from "Pinafore." He has little to tell of wild adventure with aborigines or "bush-rangers," or of the manners and customs of these before they had been reduced to their present comparatively unimportant position. He prefers to deal with manners in the great towns, and problems of the now vigorously developed young civilization, and his work should be to the liking of those who desire a certain amount of information and matter for reflection in their reading together with entertainment. Nor do the two authors conflict even in the actual territory covered, since Mr. Inglis treats mainly of the colony of New South Wales with its capital, Sydney, while Mr. Crawford devotes himself, besides New Zealand, to Victoria and Melbourne.

The occasion of Mr. Inglis's volume was an acute rheumatism, contracted by him while a planter's agent in a malarious district of India. He was obliged to abandon his labors and take steps for the recovery of his health. For this purpose he had recourse to Australia, and in "a few short months of its wonder-working air" found himself for the most part restored. He carries his rheumatism through the volume with him, and we come perforce to take a somewhat intimate interest in it. We are received, too, into his confidence in other ways. He is not the usual traveller who, when not scientific, as a rule is the prosperous and elegant person voyaging for pleasure or philosophical observation. He was obliged to make his own living even during his period of illness. He did so in such a number of ways as show that it is by no means the typical Yankee alone who can be esteemed the "Jack-of-all-trades," the master of ingenious resource in time of need. This writer has been in turn "cadet on a sheep run," manager of estates, gold-digger, travelling agent, newspaper correspondent, and editor. When we take leave of him he is the secretary of a Sydney insurance company. Once he goes by steamer a long journey up the coast. He pronounces this kind of accommodation "unutterably vile," as indeed it must everywhere seem, to one accustomed to a certain scale of consideration. But again he journeys to the Blue Mountains—where there is to be seen a notable piece of railway engineering called the Zigzag, presumably, from the description, somewhat like the great "Horseshoe Bend" in Pennsylvania—on a free pass; and in this case we are not surprised to hear that the road is "splendidly ballasted and the employees civility itself." These hardships should give the book a value of a practical sort to such as may be meditating removal to Australia, since the author looks at life from the point of view of a struggler for subsistence, and can give hints from his actual encounter with obstacles of the minor sort which the mere theorist might pass over. He furnishes details of wages—including the pay of the newspaper profession, which he laments as insufficient and not alluring to first-class talent—prices of food, house-rent, land, and the like. The figures given correspond fairly well to those ruling at the present time in America.

Mr. Inglis is not a profound observer, but he is an intelligent and rather sprightly one, and has grace enough to take an interest in a wide range of topics, so that there are chapters for all tastes. We read of the physical beauty and self-reliance of the women (one would think that it might be a matter of regretful melancholy at times in the mother country to see itself so invariably surpassed in this particular by the first upstart colony named), the architecture of Sydney streets, the prevailing taste for athletic exercises, and the fatally defective character of the land laws. He is in particular a great sportsman. Whoever shares his passion should have in the end a pretty comprehensive idea of whatever game—fish, flesh, or fowl—Australia

affords. The kangaroo and wallaby-driving would seem to the uninitiated the most promising in entertainment of the various forms presented. There is in this, too, the virtue of resisting the encroachments of a form of animal life which increases with such rapidity as to threaten in some districts to overwhelm both pastoral pursuits and agriculture. A cordon of whooping drivers is formed, in "the bush," about a wide tract; the dismayed marsupials are urged on to the encounter of a line of marksmen, who bring them down as fast as they can discharge their pieces; and the thing is said to have almost the excitement of a battle, with all its onsets and repulses.

The principal entertainment and profit afforded by the book are in the line of speculation and comparison forcibly suggested with the condition of affairs in the United States. The parallelism is often quite startling. It appears that certain things can only be done, under the domination of Anglo-Saxon blood, in one way; or at any rate that certain phenomena are incidental to its elementary stages of development the world around, irrespective of climate. There are passages, both of description and comment, which make the work half seem no more than one of those ingenious forms of periphrasis, as the 'History of the Kingdom of Lao,' and the like, in which, under the thin disguise of a foreign nomenclature, writers have discoursed of the actual events and appearances about them. The traveller finds the log-cabin, the post-and-rail fence, the self-sufficient and untrifled bearing, and the invitation to the "bar" to partake of alcoholic drinks, as the indigenous form of hospitality in Australia, as in the American West. The servant question is a crying evil. Man and maid pay their employers little deference, and walk off and leave them in critical situations with entire unconcern. Socialistic agitation has begun among the workmen; and though neither the face of the country nor the varied industries of which it is capable have been developed to any noticeable extent, local Kearneys have arisen, who not only oppose the Chinese but even the coming of further immigrants from the mother country, declaring that the labor market is already overstocked. The claim is supported by strikes against the reduction of wages below a certain nominal high figure, regardless of the fact that, owing to the prohibition of cheap labor, the necessities of life command prices which make the nominally high remuneration actually but very moderate. It is useful to know that the Chinese, who are the market-gardeners and florists of the country, where not interfered with, have made steady and good citizens, become Europeanized in dress, and attained to a considerable prosperity.

In Australia as in America there are "rings." By a "job" of corrupt aldermen the city of Sydney paid something near two millions of dollars for sewers which were planked only with boards, speedily fell to pieces, and emit still, occasionally, effluvia turning jewellers' metal-work blue. The hands employed on this job drank champagne, and the head contractor cleared a round quarter of a million. In Australia, as in America, "the best men" do not get into politics. There remains a tradition of a time when they did, but it is not now. Blatant fellows, mere adventurers, making politics a profession, who can "outswear a bullock-driver and out-drink a distiller's drayman," it is said, secure elections to Parliament, and find the readiest and most serviceable weapons there to be abuse and calumny. The vast dimensions to which the civil service has attained, as a source of danger to free institutions, is an Australian as well as an American complaint. This is the more singular, since there the English system of tenure during good behavior, ostensibly at least, prevails, and the schoolmaster in politics may be called to remark that there may be other evils in a civil service than rotation in office. It would seem that the difficulty of "rotating" has led to the putting in of supernumeraries by interested friends to such an extent that "nearly every tenth man you meet is in some degree or other the recipient of money from the public funds. If not checked, this threatens to menace the very foundations of stable government, and reduce the country to the condition of a vast lucky bag into which every hand shall be dipped to fish up as much as his grasp can hold."

In social life the surly, purse-proud ignoramus, arbiter of his own fortunes, assumes an exceedingly prominent place. The youth are wanting in respect to their elders. Young Australia, in his turn, is pert, impudent, confident in his own superior information—as well he may be in the matter of book-learning at least, since he has good public schools at which to acquire it, whereas it was much if his hard-working immigrant progenitors could read and write. He is perhaps to be the successor in the same field of the typical Young America of the comic cartoonists. At a later stage, when he takes to evil courses, which he does to an extent that "threatens dire consequences," he develops into a social scourge, "devoid of respect for age, sex, or rank, and up to every villany and outrage." As San Francisco has originated the "hoodlum," Sydney gives us the "larrikin," new names for that very old, old product, the mongrel corner-loafer. The suffrage is the freest in the known world, being enjoyed by all of the male sex after a residence of six months, and this "manhood suffrage" is not at all exercised with discretion. Religion of the regular sort is slightly treated. The sturdy parvenus thanking only themselves for their success, and feeling little need of a Providence, "make a religion of mammon-worship," or, if of another sort, turn to the spiritists, false

* 'Our Australian Cousins. By James Inglis, author of 'Sport and Work on the Nepal Frontier,' etc.' London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

prophets, and sensation-mongers of all sorts, who abound as plentifully as with ourselves.

Australian society, our informant assures us, is cursed, as with a dry rot, with commercial dishonesty and corrupt government. He does not mince matters, and is not backward in calling things by what he deems their true names. But we are not, after all, hurried along with him at exactly the same pace. His forebodings seem extreme. He has the air of being too close to his subject, and suffering too much from the irritation of actual friction with what are undoubtedly disagreeable circumstances, to make allowances with a sufficiently calm judgment. He finds it hard to realize, perhaps, that everything else is not as permanent as his solidly built city of Sydney, in which there are residences of freestone, for the prosperous of the community, costing one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. At the distance of twelve thousand miles, however, the transitional state of the country, the probably ephemeral character of most of the phenomena now apparent, stand out with a greater distinctness. We see the manners of a period of turmoil and eager effervescence of heterogeneous elements. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that we are looking at a finality, at a civilization rotten ere it yet be in any manner ripe. Nothing seems clearer than that the society which, sprung from the penal colony of Botany Bay as its starting point, and recruited since from the paupers and incapables of all the earth, has attained to such marvellous heights of prosperity, is not going to be wrecked by the obstacles named, nor wrecked at all till it has reached a certain logical completeness of development. This seems so indisputably the thing to be expected for Australia that a certain retrospective comfort may be taken. It tends to lighten considerably the prospect in our own case to find conditions, which have often been asserted to be peculiarly American and the product of our institutions, springing up at the antipodes under such diverse auspices. The evils reviewed seem those of a rude, exuberant youth, lacking in the kind of prudence that foresees at the start the remote consequences of actions, and too eager in new achievements to guard properly the fruits of the old. And since so definite a progress in refinement and the abatement of these conditions may be noted, in the older portions of the United States at least, an entire victory over them in time may not be so wild an inference. The vast preponderance of the constructive and conservative over the disintegrating forces, even in the rudest society, stands out in this contemplation of our Australian cousins with a decidedly cheerful effect.

FROM GOSHEN TO THE ARNON.*

THE anonymous book before us is a bold attempt to revolutionize the legends and geography of the Exodus and erect a slender structure of facts out of almost pulverized materials. The character of those national legends, according to the author, was this: The Hebrews, on forcing their way into Palestine, carried with them traditions betraying a common origin, but differing, sometimes in the names of individuals or places, and sometimes in the periods to which events were assigned. This confusion was intensified by the amalgamation of Canaanitish traditions, and by the tendency of a later race of story-tellers, among a semi-barbarous people, to associate the old legends with the new abodes of the tribes. Original distinctions were lost, and a heterogeneous mass of apparently disconnected records was collected. For "after the story-teller came the embryo historian," and "there were such men both in Israel and Judah, on the right bank of the Jordan and on the left bank, in Edom and in Canaan." In a still later age the stories of different tribes were welded together, glaring inconsistencies pared down, additions and emendations made, and the whole was shaped to pass for consecutive history. And then, long before the final redaction took place, a variety of causes—such as sectional antagonisms, dynastic requirements, and the necessities of a religious scheme—conspired to distort even these early records. The earliest history was loaded with miracles, for the greater glorification of God and his people, and thus arose the "travesty" of ancient story which we possess in the books of Exodus and Numbers, and "the superstructure of pious romance of which nearly half the Book of Joshua is composed." To disentangle the manifold threads of tradition thus twisted together and woven into tissues "of the grotesque, the repulsive, and the impossible," and to separate the genuine from the false, is the task of the author; and no small task, indeed. Let us hear some of the results of his investigation.

That a Semitic tribe of nomadic habits exchanged a state of servitude in Egypt for the freedom of the wilderness some time between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries B.C. "may be regarded as an historical fact"; the memory of the occurrence, so generally preserved in the traditions of the people of Israel, must have rested "on a substratum of fact." How did that tribe come to Egypt? The story of Joseph, including his bargains with the Egyptians during the famine—"if we read between the lines"—presents the original form of the tradition: famine forced the nomads to seek food in Egypt; they gave their money and flocks for bread, and bartered their free-

dom for the privilege of settling in Goshen. The Egyptian governor who received and settled them became in time an ancestral hero of their own—Joseph. How long they sojourned in Goshen cannot be ascertained. Excessive oppression finally made them prefer starvation in the wilderness to life under the taskmaster. They left Goshen, a district adjoining Tanis, to go towards the land of Edom, where kindred tribes of Terahites dwelled. That land was, in fact, the Canaan of the patriarchs: the migration of the earliest Terahites from the East did *not* take place from the north to the south, through Palestine, as the narratives of Abraham represent. The leadership of Moses may be historical, and it may not. The delivered, runaway, or thrust-out slaves took the direct road towards their objective point. They marched east through the desert plateau of Tih, the Biblical wilderness of Shur. The story of the crossing of the Red Sea is not only a preposterous tradition, but a tradition of very late origin, unknown to the Israelites of the time of the judges, or of the earlier monarchy; it owes its origin to the misunderstanding of a poetical line. The Gulf of Suez was not even touched by the Hebrews; its name was *not Yam Suph*; these words do *not* signify Sea of Reeds (or Weeds); the Yam Suph of the Scriptures is the Gulf of Akaba, and the meaning of the name is, *sea of storms* (*suph* being = *supha*). The barren Tih was traversed, as the necessity of the case required, in a number of days, not of years. Marah and Elim were *not* stations in the direction of what is now known, and falsely known, as the Sinaitic Peninsula. The Amalekites, whose abode was in the Idumean Mountains, east of the barren valley of Arabah or Ghor, did *not* proceed to the shores of the Gulf of Suez to fight the Hebrews at Rephidim; they encountered them near their own border. Elim is identical with Elath or Eloth, that is, the classical *Ælana*, at the head of the Gulf of Akaba. Mount Sinai, where the covenant with Jehovah was concluded, was neither Jebel Serbal nor Jebel Musa, nor any mount or peak in the so-called Sinaitic Peninsula—for the freed people and their leaders could not, without being insane, have ventured to toil in their flight through the rugged intricacies west and south of the Jebel et Tih—but the mountain overhanging the ancient city of Petra on the west, the mountain generally identified with Mount Hor. Hor, Sinai, Horeb, and Paran were names of the same mountain in different legends. And so was the wilderness of Sinai variously called the wilderness of Sin, of Zin, of Kadesh, of Paran—this last name never having designated the Mount Feiran of the peninsula. Kadesh, where the Israelites dwelt so long, is another name for Petra (Sela) itself, which was known also as Rekem. The Ain Musa, which flows through the great cleft of that famous rock-city of the Horites (or Troglodytes), is the stream to which was attached the Mosaic miracle of cleaving the rock for supplying water to the thirsty people. This miracle, like many others, is variously told. To Hor-Sinai the Israelites proceeded from *Ælana* (Akaba), marching through the inhospitable region of the Southern Araba. It was there that Jethro, a sheikh of a kindred people, the Midianites, received them—on the confines of his own land—and became their guide and ally. Midian is wrongly extended by expositors to the west of the *Ælanitic* Gulf, to meet the exigencies of misinterpreted traditions. The Zered, which the Hebrews reached after turning the lands of kindred tribes, is not the Wady el Ahys which formed the southern boundary of Moab, but the Mojeb—that is, the Arnon of other traditions—which separated Moab, on the north, from the land of the Amorites. With the crossing of the Arnon and the conquest of the Amorite territories the "wanderings" of the "Beni Israel" were at an end. When the Jordan was crossed, at a later period, new legends extended the wanderings to the latter river. Judah, a Hebrew but not properly an Israelitish tribe—according to the early usage of the names—effected its settlement in Palestine separately. Each portion of the Hebrew people absorbed considerable non-Hebrew elements. The amalgamation began early, and lasted long.

Most of these, and many other similarly bold and apparently venturesome readjustments of the Biblical traditions concerning the Hebrew migration are closely entwined with each other, and must necessarily stand or fall together. The author propounds them with much force and unusual clearness, and supports them with a great deal of learning, ingenuity, and sound argument; and yet he fails to convince us. It is the negative part of his arguments of which we fully acknowledge the force as against current notions, whether founded on a blind belief in the words of the Hebrew Scriptures or on quasi-critical adaptations of ancient tales to modern historical views: his positive combinations are strongly exposed to attack in his own manner and with similar weapons. It is true, the objections which can be made to these new views do not possess the keenness with which he exposes the incongruities and absurdities of the old, but these are incongruities and absurdities of legends—of legends wild-grown and carelessly woven together—while the weak sides of his critical constructions are those of tradition rectified into plausible history. Were we forced to choose between the narratives of the books of Exodus, Numbers, etc., considered *as history*—even leaving out all the miracles—and the schemes of the book before us, we should readily incline toward the latter; but no such choice is incumbent upon us. The legends of Scripture betray differences of origin: why should

* The Hebrew Migration from Egypt. London: Tinsler & Co. 8vo, pp. 440. 1879.

they not? They abound in incongruities as they do in miracles; they are full of discrepancies. Why was the "Mount of God" placed so far out of any natural route which the Hebrews, coming up from Egypt, would have chosen? Probably because the Hebrews only *heard* of such a mountain; hence also the vagueness in names and locations—none of the poets and narrators had seen Sinai. How did the strange story of a great people wandering for forty years aimlessly through a small desert, and all the time living on manna, arise and gain credence? In the same way as the stories of the crossing of the people through the parted Red Sea, or through the parted Jordan. The false interpretation of a poetical stanza may as naturally have created a wonderfully strange belief in the earlier ages of Israel's history as in the times of the "ignorant scribes."

On the other hand, if, in order to reduce the ancient traditions to sound proportions, we discard the crossing of the Red Sea as a very late amplification of the old stories, reject the march south of the Tih as too preposterous even for a tale, make the Hebrews cross the wilderness in a week or two, and identify the Mount of God with a mountain of western Idumæa—how is it that this Sinai, situated so near the border of Palestine, so completely vanished out of sight, in the history of the Hebrews, after the act of the covenant on which their national existence was believed to rest? According to our author, Saul fought the Amalekites in that very region, and held it with the sword, and David roamed in it—in the wilderness of Paran—while the first husband of his Abigail lived in the adjoining Maon (which he identifies with Maan, east of Petra); David and Solomon—this is not dependent upon new identifications—reigned over Idumæa, Jehoshaphat passed through it with the prophet Elisha, Amaziah captured Petra itself, the Hasmoneans subdued the Idumæans, Herod was himself an Idumæan—all this being so, how is it that Mount Sinai is not once mentioned in connection with one of those reigns, not once mentioned in the history of Judah or of the restored realm? that the prophets are all silent about it—unless Habakkuk's "Mount Paran" implies it? that the rabbis of the Mishnah knew it only, like a myth, from Scriptural accounts? that "all that Paul and Josephus knew about the mountain was that it was somewhere in Arabia"? that "Eusebius was unable to give more specific information"? The only instance in which the Mount of God reappears in the Biblical narratives of the post-Mosaic times is the account of the prophet Elijah's visit to it—"a transparent parable drawn on the lines of the narrative of Moses"—and according to that account the mountain was reached from the Wilderness only after a walk of forty days and forty nights. Our author meets a part of these objections, but with arguments, historical-philosophical and linguistic, which only an *à priori* conviction that Sinai *must* be sought near Petra, can possibly find satisfactory. That the Hebrew poets believed Sinai to be somewhere in Seir, or Edom, is clear, but where were to them the southern boundaries of that land? how far stretched its Teman? might not this have extended to the south extremity of the Gulf of Akaba, both west and east? Did the Hebrew poets use their geographical terms with more strictness than modern historians have used the names Savoy, Piedmont or Sardinia, Brandenburg or Prussia, Thuringia, Saxony, and the like?

Although unable to subscribe to the critical reconstructions of the book

before us, we cannot refrain from acknowledging that it will prove very useful by clearly exhibiting the yoke under which the strict upholders of the authenticity of the Pentateuch narratives must pass and repass. It does it in a very forcible and at the same time very pleasant way. Its strictures are sharp, but not rude; its sarcasm is pungent, but not offensive. It is to be regretted that the author has entered upon so vast a field of enquiry without an adequate knowledge of Hebrew. This lack many a time betrays him into propping up his arguments with supports worse than flimsy. There can hardly be anything more primitive in philological criticism than to say that the name Etham "seems to have been formed in an early dialect from *Eth*, near, and would signify the 'near places'" (p. 99); that Jaakan, in Bene-Jaakan, may be "a corruption of Isaac, the *Zade* having been transcribed *Ain*" (p. 336—as if this alone could explain the error); or that it is "at least as likely" that the name of Mount Horeb is derived from *hër*, a hole or cavern, whence *hëri*, a Horite or cave-dweller, as that it is identical with *hëreb*, "dry" [*sic*], as Gesenius has it (p. 103—which is like saying that our *herb* can at least as well be derived from Ger. *Achre* as from Fr. *herbe*, Lat. *herba*). The book teems with misprints in Hebrew words; *midbar* is always spelled *midbhar*. On the other hand, fine critical remarks of the lighter kind are also abundant, and scholars will not fail to avail themselves of those which may be new to them.

An Essay on the Life and Genius of Calderon. With Translations from his 'Life's a Dream' and 'Great Theatre of the World.' By the Archbishop of Dublin and Chancellor of the Order of St. Patrick. Second edition, revised and improved. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.)—In noticing Miss Hasell's work on Calderon in the *Nation* (No. 762) we mentioned Archbishop Trench's admirable monograph, which was republished in this country over twenty years ago, and which has long been out of print both here and in England. Although the book is still asked for, the writer apologizes for its republication on the ground that the interest in the poet is exceedingly faint. We think, however, that the Archbishop is too modest: his little work will not only preserve what interest there is, but will surely increase it, besides forming an admirable supplement to Miss Hasell's pleasant sketch. The present edition has been brought up to the present time by the mention of recent articles in periodicals, etc., and we can heartily commend the volume for its sound literary judgment and the finished translations which it contains.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Arnold (M.), <i>Passages from Prose Writings</i>	(Macmillan & Co.)	\$1 50
Bastian (Dr. H. C.), <i>The Brain as an Organ of Mind</i>	(D. Appleton & Co.)	1 50
Benfey (T.), <i>Vedica and Linguistica</i> , swd.....	(Trubner & Co.)	1 50
Bucknill (Dr. J. C.), <i>Care of the Insane</i>	(Macmillan & Co.)	1 00
Church (F. J.), <i>Trial and Death of Socrates</i>	"	"
Grimm (J.), <i>Goethe</i> , 2d ed., swd.....	(R. Westermann & Co.)	3 00
Hase (K.), <i>Miracle Plays and Sacred Dramas</i>	(Houghton, Mifflin & Co.)	75
Lankester (Prof. E. R.), <i>Degeneration</i>	(Macmillan & Co.)	40
Lanza (Clara), <i>Tit for Tat: a Tale</i> , swd.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)	6 00
Larned (Ellen D.), <i>History of Windham County, Conn.</i> , vol. II.....	(Worcester)	1 00
Lovett (V. L.), <i>Our Future Highway to India</i>	(Macmillan & Co.)	3 00
Salvage: a Tale.....	(Roberts Bros.)	3 00
Scott (R. F.), <i>Theory of Determinants</i>	(Macmillan & Co.)	3 50
Tchitchatchef (P. de), <i>Espagne, Algérie, et Tunisie</i> , swd.....	(J. B. Baillière et Fils)	
Turner (Dr. H. E.), <i>Settlers of Aquidneck</i>	(Newport Hist. Society)	
Vapereau (G.), <i>Dictionnaire des Contemporains</i> , Part 7, swd.....	(F. W. Christern)	
Zola (E.), <i>Clorinda: a Tale</i> , swd.....	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.)	75

Leisure-Hour Series.

16mo, \$1 per volume.

RECENT AND FAVORITE VOLUMES.

TROUBLESOME DAUGHTERS. By Mrs. L. B. Walford.

CHRISTY CAREW. By May Laffan.

DEMOCRACY. An American Novel.

CAPTAIN FRACASSE. By Théophile Gautier.

CAVENDISH'S CARD ESSAYS, CLAY'S Decisions, and Card-Table Talk.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

TEACHERS SHOULD EXAMINE
Leffingwell's Reading-Book of
English Classics.

Beautifully printed, in octavo, cloth extra, \$1 50.

The aim of this volume is to provide for young readers an attractive introduction to sound literature. Teachers who wish to cultivate in their pupils a taste for reading of a high order, and to make them acquainted with great authors and their works, will find this volume adapted to their use.

"I find in your method much to admire."—Bishop Robertson, of Missouri.

"I am mightily pleased with it."—Otis Bisset, Riverview Academy, Foughbridge, N. Y.

"The selections are made with wise taste and judgment."—I congratulate you."—Pres. Tressler, of Carthage College.

"Admirably adapted to its purpose."—Rev. G. Gannett, Gannett Institute, Boston, Mass.

The volume has received similar hearty commendation from hundreds of practical instructors.

A Pocket Classical Dictionary

FOR READY REFERENCE.

COMPILED BY

FREDERICK G. IRELAND.

16mo, cloth extra, 75 cents.

"A comely, concise, and correct little book which it is a pleasure to commend."—C. J. F. Bancroft, Principal Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.

"Contains just what every one wants to know, and no more. I have recommended it to our students."—B. L. Cilley, Exeter, N. H.

"Concise, comprehensive, and very convenient."—Madisonensis.

"Thoroughly trustworthy."—Barnes's Educational Monthly.

Specimen copies of the above works (and of our text-books generally) sent to teachers on receipt of half the price. Liberal terms for introduction.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,

182 Fifth Avenue, New York.

French and German Books.

All new and popular French and German Works received as soon as issued. Catalogues of old and new French, German, and English Books furnished upon application.

JOHN PENINGTON & SON,

127 South Seventh Street, Philadelphia.

REDUCED IN PRICE.

Two Standard Latin Dictionaries.

GARDNER'S LATIN LEXICON from..... \$3 00 to \$2 25
LEVERETT'S LATIN LEXICON from..... 5 50 to 3 50

Gardner's Latin Lexicon.

A Dictionary of the Latin Language, particularly adapted to the Classics usually studied preparatory to a Collegiate Course. By Francis Gardner, A.M. 8vo, sheep, \$2 25.

The basis of this work is Leverett's Lexicon, but while all the words have been retained which appear in the larger work, the number of illustrative citations has been abridged, and the authors drawn upon restricted only to those who are usually read previously to the higher college course. The superior compactness secured by this arrangement better adapts the work to the use of beginners.

Leverett's Latin Lexicon.

A Copious Lexicon of the Latin Language. Compiled chiefly from the Magnum Totius Latinitatis Lexicon of Faccioliati and Forcellini, and the German Works of Scheller and Luenemann, embracing the Classical Distinctions of Words, and the Etymological Index of Freund's Lexicon. By F. P. Leverett. Large 8vo, sheep, \$3 50.

This work contains all the words in the Latin language, embracing those used by authors of the classical, ante-classical, and post-classical periods, with words of modern origin coined for scientific and other purposes. The etymology of every word is given, and all its different shades of meaning are carefully discriminated and illustrated by citations from the standard authors. The work is also intended as a Gradus, and the quantity of the syllables has been marked wherever it could be accurately ascertained.

* For sale by all booksellers, or will be sent by mail, postage prepaid, on receipt of the price by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., Publishers,
715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

Cassell, Petter, Galpin & CO.

Have just published the following

VALUABLE BOOKS:

THE ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF

Canaries and Cage-Birds. By W. A. Blakston, W. Swainsland, and August F. Wiener, F.Z.S. Illustrated with 56 full-page plates in lithography and many other illustrations. Demy 4to, cloth, full-gilt side and edges, \$15; half-morocco, gilt edges, \$20.

THE PICTORIAL TOUR OF THE

World. Comprising Incident, Adventure, and Scenery in all parts of the Globe. With upwards of 100 illustrations and 12 beautiful colored plates. Crown 4to, 508 pages, cloth, full-gilt side and edges, \$3 50.

THROUGH THE LIGHT CONTI-

nent; or, The United States in 1877-8. By William Saunders. Second edition. Cloth extra, \$2 50.

"Mr. Saunders's book is exhaustive and has a permanent value. In fine, there are few chapters in the book from which an American may not obtain both instruction and food for reflection."—*The Nation*.

A SERIES OF CHARACTER

Sketches from Charles Dickens. Consisting of six fac-simile reproductions of Drawings by Fred. Barnard, executed in chromo-lithography. In portfolio, size 11x14, per set, \$2; large edition of above, large folio size, per set, \$6.

"They are full of spirit, and remind one of Cruikshank, though they happily avoid the little eccentricities of his style."—*Cincinnati Gazette*.

"The most brilliant and striking illustrations ever made of the characters of Dickens are the large drawings of Fred. Barnard."—*Boston Advertiser*.

CHRIST OUR REDEEMER. Being

Thoughts and Meditations upon our Lord's Life. Selected and analytically arranged by Henry Southgate. 312 pages, cloth extra, gilt edges, \$1 50.

HISTORY OF THE WALDENSES.

By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D., author of 'Daybreak in Spain.' 212 pages, illustrated, cloth extra, \$1 25.

OUR OWN COUNTRY (ENG-

land). Descriptive, Historical, Pictorial. With many illustrations. Demy 4to, cloth, Vol. II., \$3.

THE SEA: Its Stirring Story of Ad-

venture, Peril, and Heroism. By F. Whympers. Well illustrated. Demy 4to, cloth, \$3.

WOMAN'S WORK AND WORTH.

In Girlhood, Maidenhood, and Wifehood. Illustrations of Woman's Character, Duties, Rights, Position, Influence, Responsibilities, and Opportunities. With Hints on Self-Culture, and Chapters on the Higher Education of Women. By W. H. Davenport Adams, author of 'Dictionary of English Literature.' 651 pages, crown 8vo, cloth extra, \$2 50.

CONTENTS: Chapter I. Woman as the Mother.—II. Woman as the Wife.—III. Woman as Maiden.—IV. Woman in the World of Letters.—V. Woman in the World of Art.—VI. Woman as the Heroine, Enthusiast, and Social Reformer.—VII. The Higher Education of Women.—VIII. Employment for Educated Women.

"A volume which should give comfort to all who are laboring for the elevation of woman, and which is adapted to contribute to the entertainment and the knowledge of readers of either sex. One can hardly open the pages anywhere without finding something suggestive and readable."—*Boston Journal*.

"Every woman and every girl desirous of self-improvement and interested in knowing what other women have accomplished should possess a copy of this work, which is one of the most comprehensive of the kind published, and is written in a style which makes it more interesting than a novel."—*Demorest's Monthly*.

❧ If not for sale by your bookseller, will be sent, prepaid, on receipt of price.

❧ Send for our New Catalogue, now ready, with list of new and coming Books for the fall season.

CASSELL, PETTER, GALPIN & CO.,

London, Paris, and 525 Broadway, New York.

Robert Clarke & Co.,

CINCINNATI, O.,

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED THE FOLLOWING

NEW ART BOOKS.

Pottery Decoration.

MISS M. LOUISE McLAUGHLIN'S Pottery Decoration: being a Practical Manual of Under-Glaze Painting, including complete details of the author's method of Painting Enamelled Faience. Square 12mo, fancy boards, \$1.

Charcoal-Drawing.

KARL ROBERT'S Charcoal-Drawing without a Master. A complete Treatise in Landscape-Drawing in Charcoal, with Lessons and Studies after Allonge. Translated by Miss E. H. Appleton. Illustrated. 8vo, cloth, \$1.

Modelling in Clay.

A. L. VAGO'S Instructions in the Art of Modelling in Clay; with an Appendix on Modelling in Foilage, etc., for Pottery and Architectural Decoration, by Benn Pitmann, of the Cincinnati School of Design. Square 12mo, cloth, \$1.

NINTH THOUSAND.

MISS McLAUGHLIN'S China-Painting. A Manual for the Decoration of Hard Porcelain. Square 12mo, fancy boards, 75 cents.

❧ Any of the above sent by mail, prepaid, on receipt of the price, or may be ordered through any book or art store.

ROBERT CLARKE & CO., Publishers.

Two Valuable Text-Books.

WURTZ'S ELEMENTS OF MO-

dem Chemistry. By Adolph Wurtz. Translated and edited, with the approbation of the author, from the fourth French edition, by Wm. H. Greene, M.D., formerly Demonstrator of Chemistry in Jefferson College, Philadelphia. With 132 illustrations. 8vo, extra cloth, \$2 50; sheep, \$3.

"There are a great many text-books on chemistry in the field already, but we know of none that will fill the wants of the student so completely as this. It presents the facts of organic as well as inorganic chemistry without being as voluminous as Fownes, as condensed as Barker, or as unsystematic as Roscoe. The theoretical part is clearly told, the progress of the exposition being illustrated by experiments. The book is excellently printed and fully illustrated."—*New York Medical Record*.

PRANTL'S TEXT-BOOK OF

Botany. An Elementary Text-Book of Botany. Translated from the German of Dr. K. Prantl, Professor of Botany in the Royal Academy of Forestry, Aschaffenburg, Bavaria. The translation revised by S. H. Vines, M.A., D.Sc., F.L.S., Fellow and Lecturer of Christ's College, Cambridge. With 275 illustrations. 8vo, extra cloth, \$2 25.

"The work is thorough and practical, and beautifully illustrated. It should be examined by every American teacher and student of botany."—*Boston National Journal of Education*.

"It is with a safe conscience that we would recommend this book as the best of its kind in the English language."—*London Nature*.

❧ For sale by booksellers generally, or will be sent by mail, post-paid, upon receipt of the price by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PUBLISHERS,
715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

New Work on the Calculus.

Will be published August 28,

AN ELEMENTARY TREATISE

ON THE

Differential and Integral Calculus.

With numerous Examples. By Edward A. Bowser, Prof. of Mathematics and Engineering in Rutgers College. Large 12mo volume, 400 pages, price \$2 25.

Just published by the same author, a Second Revised Edition of
An Elementary Treatise on Analytic Geometry,

Embracing Plane Geometry and an Introduction to Geometry of Three Dimensions. 12mo, price \$1 75.

D. VAN NOSTRAND, Publisher,
23 Murray and 27 Warren Streets, New York

❧ Copies sent free by mail on receipt of price.

Macmillan & Co.'s

Classical Series

FOR COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS.

June, 1885.

Being select portions of Greek and Latin authors, edited with Introductions and Notes at the end, by eminent scholars. The series is designed to supply first-rate text-books for the higher forms of schools, having in view also the needs of candidates for public examinations at the Universities and elsewhere.

The following volumes are ready:

ÆSCHYLUS. *Persæ*. Edited by A. O. Prickard, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. With Map. 80 cents.

CATULLUS. *Select Poems*. Edited by F. P. Simpson, B.A., late Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford. New and revised edition. \$1 10.

CICERO. *The Second Philippic Oration*. From the German of Karl Halm. Edited, with Corrections and Additions, by John E. B. Mayor, Professor of Latin in the University of Cambridge. New edition, revised. \$1.

— *The Catiline Orations*. From the German of Karl Halm. Edited, with Additions, by A. S. Wilkins, M.A., Professor of Latin at the Owens College, Manchester. New edition. 90 cents.

— *The Academics*. Edited by James Reid, M.A., Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge. \$1.

— *Pro Lege Manilia*. Edited after Halm. By Prof. A. S. Wilkins, M.A. 75 cents.

— *Pro Roscio Amerino*. Edited after Halm. By E. H. Donkin, M.A., late Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford. 90 cents.

DEMOSTHENES. *The Oration on the Crown*. Edited by B. Drake, M.A., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Sixth and revised edition. \$1.

HOMER'S ODYSSEY. *The Narrative of Odysseus*, Books IX.-XII. Edited by John E. B. Mayor, M.A. Part I. 75 cents.

JUVENAL. *Select Satires*. Edited by John E. B. Mayor, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Professor of Latin. Satires X. and XI., 75 cents. Satires XII.-XVI., 80 cents.

LIVY. *Hannibal's First Campaign in Italy*. Books XXI. and XXII. Edited by the Rev. W. W. Capes, Reader in Ancient History at Oxford. With 3 Maps, \$1 10.

MARTIAL. *Select Epigrams*. Edited by Rev. H. M. Stephenson, M.A., Head-Master of St. Peter's School, York. \$1 50.

OVID. *Heroidum Epistulæ* XIII. Edited by E. S. Shuckburgh, M.A. \$1 10.

SALLUST. *Catiline and Jugurtha*. Edited by C. Merivale, B.D. New edition, carefully revised and enlarged. \$1 10. Or separately, 60 cents each.

TACITUS. *Agricola and Germania*. Edited by A. J. Church, M.A., and W. J. Brodribb, M.A. Translators of Tacitus. New edition. 90 cents. Or separately, 55 cents each.

— *The Annals*. Book VI. By the same Editors. 60 cents.

TERENCE. *Hauton Timorumenos*. Edited by E. S. Shuckburgh, M.A., Assistant-Master at Eton College. 75 cents. With Translation, \$1.

— *Phormio*. Edited by Rev. John Bond, M.A., and A. S. Walpole, B.A. \$1.

THUCYDIDES. *The Sicilian Expedition*. Books VI. and VII. Edited by the Rev. Percival Frost, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. New edition, revised and enlarged, with Map. \$1 25.

XENOPHON. *Hellenica*. Books I. and II. Edited by H. Hailstone, B.A., late Scholar of Peterhouse, Cambridge. With Map. \$1.

— *Cyropædia*. Books VII. and VIII. Edited by Alfred Goodwin, M.A., Professor of Greek in University College, London. \$1.

— *Memorabilia Socratis*. Edited by A. R. Cluer, B.A., Balliol College, Oxford. \$1 30.

Macmillan & Co.'s New Classified Catalogue, embracing the Publications of the Oxford Clarendon Press and the Cambridge University Press, besides their own, is now ready, and will be sent, free by mail, on receipt of six cents.

MACMILLAN & CO.,

22 Bond Street, New York.

m
th
po
an
re
th
as
in
a
P
th
th
ho
"
an
It
de
w
ou
an

m
m
"
to
"
m
an
o
fu
p
n
d

th
P
p
g
d
th
e
t
b
T
L
g
R
g
a
o
i
v
b
a
r